

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1896.

A DISCUSSION OF CATULLUS] LXII., 39—58.

THE purpose of this paper is to show that in vss. 45 and 56 *dum...dum* are correlatives and must be interpreted literally as "the while...the while," that is, as equal to *quam diu...tam diu*. This explanation is by no means new, since it was advocated by no less an authority than Quintilian. It has been adopted in recent times by Riese (1884), Baehrens (1885), Schmalz (1890), and Hale (1894). It is rejected, however, by Ellis (1889), Merrill (1893), and Simpson (1894, reprint of edition of 1879).¹ These three editors agree in denying that the *dum*-clauses are correlative, and in holding that both are dependent on *est*, to be supplied with *sic*. In the fact that I believe this view to be both flat and erroneous is to be found the justification for my paper. Further, though the view I advocate is not new, I think I may say that the particular line of argument used in its support is novel, as well as sound.

There has been some uncertainty as to the text in the two verses named. In 45, according to Prof. Ellis, most MSS. give *tum cara*, whereas in 56 only one shows *tum*. On the other hand we have the positive testimony of Quintilian, ix. 3. 16. The chapter is entitled *De figuris verborum*, and treats of variations from the normal in the use of words. In § 14 Quint. remarks that many *figuræ* spring from a love of antiquity: *Alia commendatio vetustatis, cuius amator unice Vergilius fuit*. Several illustrative passages are then cited from Vergil, and

¹ Munro's *Elucidations* I have not been able to see.

finally in § 16 we read: *Pleni talibus antiqui: . . . Catullus in Epithalamio Dum innupta² manet, dum cara suis est, cum prius dum significet quoad, sequens usque eo*. At the present time editors are practically agreed in reading *dum . . . dum* in both verses. Thus, even Professors Ellis and Merrill accept Quintilian's testimony as to the text, though they refuse to admit his interpretation. The former's note runs: "He (Quint.) explains the line 'as long as she remains unwed, so long is she dear to her kinsmen.' . . . It is not necessary to interpret Catullus so harshly. *Sic* may contain the predicate *optata est*, implied in the protasis of the simile, 'so is the virgin desirable while she remains unprofaned, while she is dear to her kinsmen.'" On this view something will be said presently. Prof. Merrill, after a brief reference to Quintilian's view, writes: "But comparison with v. 56 indicates that Quintilian misunderstood the meaning of Catullus as much as did the less learned emendators of V and T, who changed the second *dum* to *tum*. The two *dum*-clauses are not correlative, but coördinate, both modifying *sic virgo* (*sc. est*), while *sic* is emphatic, referring to v. 42. Thus v. 45 corresponds alone to vv. 39-42, while vv. 46-47 correspond to vv. 43-44." Now I believe that Prof. Merrill has rightly

² No importance can be attached to the fact that Quint. gives *innupta* here, for he was doubtless quoting from memory. See Baehrens ad loc. For similar slips by others, e.g., Aristotle, see Jebb on *Soph. Antig.* 220, and Humphrey's note on same verse in his appendix.

divided the stanza into its balancing parts, but I shall try to show presently that his method of interpretation does not naturally lead to the results which he sets forth. I call especial attention to the sentence beginning 'But comparison with v. 56,' because it embodies a method of interpreting our passage which, it seems to me, is wholly erroneous.¹ To my mind, the sense of v. 56 must be determined from that of v. 45. To interpret 45 from 56 is to me an inversion of the proper process. This declaration leads naturally to the statement of my main point, which is, that more account must be taken of the *form* of the poem than has been done by any of the recent editors. Ellis, Riese and Baehrens all call attention to the amoebean character of the poem, but none of them makes full use of this point in its criticism and interpretation.

It is well known that the law of Amoebean poetry is that the utterances of the second speaker shall correspond in form and contents to those of the leader. See Conington's introductions to the third, seventh and eighth Eclogues of Vergil, and Mr. Page's prefatory note to Horace, *Carmina* iii. 9. I need hardly remind the reader how finely this law is obeyed by Horace. In Eclogue iii. the dialogue covers 48 verses, each competitor delivering twelve strains of two verses each; in Eclogue vii. we have again 48 verses, divided into twelve strains of four verses each. How far did Catullus obey this rule in the poem before us? The hymn falls into three parts. Vss. 1-18 are introductory; 20-59 form the *carmen amoebaeum* proper; 60-66 constitute a sort of epilogue, spoken either by the youths or by the poet himself. In the introduction there was evidently no striving after symmetry of form. Vss. 1-4, spoken by the *pueri*, are imperfectly balanced by 7 and 8, uttered by the *puellae*. The *pueri* require eight verses (11-18) to make the statements which the *puellae* set forth in two (8 and 9). Turning to the second part (20-59), or *carmen amoebaeum* proper, we note that it consisted, as it came from the poet's hand, of three pairs of stanzas.² The second of these is mutilated

¹ Prof. Ellis makes what I conceive to be essentially the same mistake, for in speaking of the text in 45 he says (p. 248, footnote): 'More decisive (sc. than MSS. evidence or Quintilian's statement) is the parallel verse 56 . . . as K. P. Schulze observes: for here *dum inculta* is given by all MSS except Thuan.' I hold it an error to attempt to extract from v. 56 any evidence as to the text or meaning of 45.

² Riese (p. 132) conjectures, though without supplying proof, that the first strophe and antistrophe contained six verses each, the second eight each, and the third ten each.

beyond recovery; only the six verses, 32-37, remain. We may therefore throw this portion entirely out of the discussion. The first strophe and antistrophe (20-31) contain each, besides the refrain, five verses, with no trace of incompleteness; it seems likely, also, that the third pair of stanzas (39-58) contained each ten verses,³ besides the refrain. We may conjecture, therefore, with great probability, though we cannot clearly prove that in the matter of form this *carmen amoebaeum* fulfilled the first law of such compositions.

Leaving now the question of form and glancing at the language, we note at once very striking resemblances. In vv. 20-25 the girls say 'How cruel thou art, Hesperus, to tear the maiden from her mother.' The lads reply 'How kind thou art, Hesperus, to give the maiden to her lover.' Cf. here again what Mr. Page has said in his preface to *Hor. C.* iii. 9. Each of these utterances consists of three sentences: a question in one v., a relative clause in three vv., and a second question in the concluding v. The final questions, *Quid faciunt hostes capta crudelius urbe* and *Quid datur a divi felici optatus hora* are clearly cases of amoebean "tit for tat." In our passage (39-58) we have in the strophe (39-47) practically a single sentence, composed of two clauses correlated by *ut* and *sic*. Each of these falls into two parts, with adversative asyndeton at the joints, i. e., at vv. 43 and 46. In the antistrophe (49-58) we have the same arrangement, except that at v. 54 the conjunction is expressed. This evident resemblance in the language, on which I need not dwell at greater length, strengthens the hypothesis accepted above that in external form there was originally complete correspondence between the parts of this amoebean song.⁴

I have dwelt at such length upon the amoebean character of the poem because on that my special line of argument depends. The points of this argument are: (1) We have here a fair specimen of the *carmen amoebaeum*; (2) the law of such *carmina* is that the leader sets the pace, so to speak, to which the other must conform; (3) that here the girls lead; and hence (4) their utterances should in each case be perfectly clear and intelligible, when taken by themselves. To put the matter concretely, it became the duty of the lads at v. 49 to reply to the statements just made by the

³ See Riese and Baehrens on v. 41.

⁴ On the structure of this poem see further Carl Ziwsa, *Die Eurhythmische Technik des Catullus*, II. Theil, pp. 11, 12. (Wien, 1883).

girls. They must do this in ten verses, and the form of their deliverance must be as like as possible to that of the girls. It is self-evident that to fulfill this task acceptably, indeed, to accomplish it at all, it was necessary for them to understand in every detail what the girls had said. Hence, in reading the poem, we must put ourselves in the position of the lads by interpreting vv. 39-47 wholly by themselves, and then we must apply the same line of interpretation to 49-58. In other words we must take a course the very opposite of that followed by Ellis and Merrill.

The next step in our discussion will be an analysis of vv. 39-47. In 39-44 the theme is the *flos*. Of this two things are said: (a) that under certain circumstances it is dear to the *pueri et puellae*, and (b) that under certain other circumstances it loses its charm for them. We may paraphrase thus: *Dum flos intactus est, carus est pueris et puellis; sed cum tactus est, non carus est*, etc. When we read *sic* in 45 we naturally expect from our knowledge both of grammar and poetic workmanship, that the correlating clause will itself be broken into two parts, corresponding exactly to those of the *ut*-clause. These we can find without trouble, since *dum intacta (virgo) manet = dum flos intactus est*, of our paraphrase, and *dum cara suis est*, if taken as Quint. interprets it, is a complete correlative to *carus est (flos) pueris et puellis*.¹ To continue, v. 46, which = *sed cum virgo tacta est*, corresponds exactly to 43, which = *sed cum flos tactus est*, and v. 47 = *virgo non cara est pueris et puellis*, is correlative to 44, which = *flos non carus est pueris et puellis*. If we interpret this stanza by itself, as I have urged, we shall inevitably, I think, arrange the several parts in this way. By so doing we get a stanza in whose art there is not a single flaw. Catullus matches two things said of the flower by two things said of the girl, and the flow of the thought, the rhythm of the language, and the balance of the structure are perfect.

Contrast the results thus secured with those obtained by Ellis and Merrill. The former says, "*sic* may well contain the predicate *optata est* implied in the protasis of the simile, 'so is the maiden desirable while she remains unprofaned, while she is dear to her kinsmen.'" This I believe to be faulty

both in grammar and in sense. (1) The protasis of the simile contains not merely *optata est*, but *non optata est* also. If, then, we supply *est* at all after *sic*, we must take as its predicate the *whole contents* of the protasis, not a part, as Ellis has done. (2) As regards the sense, To whom, I ask, is the maiden desirable? To *suae*, 'her kinsfolk'? Is it not a very flat truism to say that a girl is dear to her kinsfolk as long as she is dear to them? Or are we to say that she is dear to her lover or husband, so long as she is dear to her kinsfolk? Can we not conceive of a girl as desirable in the lover's eyes quite apart from her relation, whatever it may be, to her kin? Both views are absurd. And yet, if we follow Ellis, we must supply after the words 'so is the maiden desirable,' either 'to her kin' or 'to her lover,' for together her kin and her lover represent to her the whole world, as divided into two classes, the one including all within the circle of her family, the other all the rest of the world.

In what has been said of Prof. Ellis' view has been shown the error, I think, of Merrill's view, that *est* alone is to be supplied with *sic*. In that event, as already urged, the predicate to *est* would naturally be the whole contents of the protasis of the simile, as contained in 39-44. Thus v. 45 will correspond, not, as Merrill would have us believe, to 39-42 alone, but to all the vv. 39-44. Verses 46 and 47 would then be wholly unnecessary and therefore weak, and the complete artistic balance which we obtained before would be wholly destroyed.

Precisely the same interpretation must be applied to vv. 49-58. There is not the slightest trouble in doing this, even at v. 56, for the difficulty which editors have felt there is, I think, entirely of their own creation. The lads say two things about the *vitis*, which takes the place of the *flos* of the preceding stanza. We may paraphrase again: *dum vitis intacta est, non cara est; sed cum tacta est, cara est*. This is balanced by *dum virgo intacta est, non cara est; sed cum tacta est, cara est*. How shall we render v. 56? Simply thus: 'So the maiden, the while she remains *intacta*, the while she grows old uncared for,' a sentiment wholly in keeping with the genuine Roman ideas on the subject of marriage.²

¹ I regard *suis* in 45 as merely a variation for *pueris et puellis* virtually contained in 42, 44, and 47. Both expressions merely = 'acquaintances,' the flower and the girl being dear, or not, as the case may be, to those who are aware of their existence.

² Prof. F. D. Allen has suggested to me what is, so far as I know, wholly novel, namely, that a strong proof of the correctness of the view held in this paper is the very v. 56 which has caused most editors so much trouble. I confess that this view appeals to me with some force when I take into account the practical impossibility of gathering any predicate at

It remains to consider whether *dum...dum* can bear the meaning assigned them in this paper. On this point we have, first of all, Quintilian's testimony, as cited above. The flow of §§ 14-16 of the chapter would seem to indicate that Quint. regarded the use as an archaism, a very natural view, and one which receives confirmation from Plaut. Truc. 232 (cited by all editors of Catull.), as emended to read *Dum habeat, dum amet*. Lambinus was the first to alter the *tum amet* of the MSS., but the conjecture has been 'accepted or repeated by Hand, C. F. W. Müller, Fleckeisen, Haupt, Schwabe, Schöll, and Key, L.D. s.v.' (Ellis, p. 248, footnote.) To this list may be added Haupt (*Opusc.* ii. p. 473), Baehrens and Riese in their editions, Hale (*Anticipatory Subjunctive*, pp. 68, 69), all to *sic virgo* in v. 56 from the protasis of this simile, yet I am very far from admitting that it affects in any particular the correctness of my main argument, as based on the amoebean character of our passage.

and Schmalz in Müller's *Handbuch*, ii. p. 509. See further the critical note in the Goetz-Loewe-Schöll edition of the *Truculentus*. I have not had access to Richardson's treatise on *dum*. Good discussions are those by Haupt, Schmalz, and Hale, as cited above. The construction may be illustrated by certain uses of the Greek: see especially Haupt, *Opusc.* ii. pp. 471-473, and Ellis on v. 45. It may be added finally that both Riese and Baehrens cite Verg. Eclog. viii. 42 *Ut vidi, ut perii*, both referring to Savelsberg, Rhein. Mus. xxvi. (1871), p. 135, the latter adding Corsen, *De pronunt.* ii.² p. 856. But see Conington on the passage. Riese also cites by way of illustration *Il.* xiv. 294 *ὡς δ' ἴδεν, ὡς μιν ἔπος πυκνὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν*, and Theocr. iii. 42 *ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη*, but the appositeness of such citations is questionable.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Barnard College, New York.

MARTIANUS CAPELLA.

This author forms so important a link between the old world and the new, that a critical edition with an adequate commentary, noting sources and imitators throughout, would be a great boon to classical as well as mediaeval scholars. Kopp's notes are distinguished by infinite industry, but lack exact scholarship. Eyssenhardt's edition, published thirty years ago in the Teubner series, is handy and has a useful index. His conjectures are not often happy.

Thus in the speech of Iuppiter in praise of bride and bridegroom (§ 92 p. 25 l. 23-25)

nam nostra ille fides sermo benignitas
ac uerus genius fida recursio
interpresque meae mentis honos sacer,

Eyssenhardt substitutes for the last two words *ὁ νοῦς acer*, referring to p. 37 l. 20, where *νοῦς* occurs: he might have cited p. 104 l. 8, where we find *sacer νοῦς*. It is the extreme of prudery to reject *honos*, abstract for concrete, in a context teeming with examples of the figure. Within a few lines (i 110 117) Juvenal has *sacro honori* and *summus honos*. Nor is our African author to be saddled with the strange use of the article, or the false quantity in *acer*, without convincing evidence. Martianus, I grant, shortens *omega* (§ 327 p. 98 l. 9 in a pentameter *et scholicum praestruit axioma*) and the final vowel in *frustra* (§ 92 p. 25

l. 25, so Prudentius) and perhaps the *a* in *mortalibus* (in § 125 l. 5 6, the Adonic verses *tuque caducis | mortalibusque*, the latter verse may be a gloss on the former; cf. in Thalix's song § 126 p. 37 l. 16 *reserent caducis astra*). All the more reason that we should not add to his guilt by random guesses, where the ms. reading offends neither against prosody nor sense.

Thanks to Kopp's index many of his author's words have found a place in the lexicons; but the references are (as is the case with two other Africans, Apuleius and Arnobius) very inconsistent, sometimes to Kopp's paragraphs, sometimes to the pages of the boy Grotius. Under *animator* Lewis and Short cite 'Capitolin. i p. 13.' Forcellini has 'Martian. Capell.' Hundreds of similar blunders might have been avoided, if editors of the handy compendiums, which to the great injury of learning have ousted Gesner, Scheller, Forcellini from the desks of our students, had possessed a tolerable acquaintance with literary history, or had condescended to keep an eye on Forcellini as they corrected their proofs. Whoever passed 'Capitolin. i p. 13' for the press can never have seen either Capitolinus or Martianus. If we examine the references to Tertullian in Lewis and Short, we find many like evidences of helpless ignorance.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

(Continued from Vol. VIII. p. 13.)

XI.

IN addition to the simple terminations of the future subjunctive in $\sigma\omega$ and of the optative in $\sigma\eta\eta$, which I have already discussed, the language had at its command the reduplicated forms $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$) and $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$, $\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ($\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$, $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$). For the loss of σ in $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ there is no direct evidence; but as phonetic laws show that no other spirant than σ can have disappeared in $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ and $\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$, analogy entitles us to assume that $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ stands for $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$. There is but one absolutely certain example in Attic of this formation, $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$. The evidence for its existence is given by Mr. R. J. Walker in the *Classical Review*, vol. viii. p. 17-21. But in those dialects which had not created a firm distinction of meaning between the forms of the σ subjunctive with a short and a long vowel, the reduplication ($\sigma\epsilon\sigma$) afforded a convenient means of emphasizing the specially future use of the mood. This usage once established was the parent of the so-called Doric future. The Attic futures in ω are of a different formation, which has not as yet been satisfactorily explained.

In the case of the optative it is easy to show how the necessity arose for the employment of the reduplicated suffix or some other substitute for the original ending. The termination $\eta\eta$, which Greek inherited as the appropriate suffix for forming the singular and the third person plural of the optative from unthematic stems, was greatly restricted in use by the operation of phonetic laws. If we put aside later and purely analogical forms such as $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\iota\eta\eta$, the termination $\eta\eta$ could not exist after a vowel, as the ι would disappear. Neither could it be placed after a double consonant ending in σ . Curtius and J. Schmidt have shown that after ξ , ψ , and $\sigma\sigma$ the spirant ι is not vocalized but disappears, so that an original $\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\eta\eta$ or $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\eta\eta$ (for $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\eta\eta$) would pass into $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\eta\eta$ or $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\eta$ and be rendered useless as an optative. There is an interesting case of the working of this law in the dialect of Heraclea. That dialect changes the ϵ of the Doric future into ι before σ and ω , so that $\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ becomes $\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$; but this ι is treated as a semi-vowel and cannot exist after a double consonant. Therefore $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\iota$, $\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ become not $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$, $\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$, but $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota$ and $\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota$. The explanation of this fact is not difficult.

As Wackernagel has shown (*K.Z.* vol. xxv. p. 268), $\sigma\iota$ after a vowel becomes a palatal sibilant of such a kind that it transforms the preceding vowel into an ι diphthong and the σ thus made intervocalic disappears. This explains why no diaeresis is possible in such forms as $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\eta$, and $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\eta\eta$ for $\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\eta\eta$, while the previous existence of the σ preserves the ι . The double consonants ξ , ψ , and $\sigma\sigma$ were not capable of this palatal affection, and the ι had to disappear.

As a result of these limitations the suffix $\eta\eta$ is only to be found after an original single σ preceded by a vowel, that is, once after a radical σ , in $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ ($\sigma\eta\eta$), and everywhere after the modal σ attached to a vowel stem, as in $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\eta\eta$ for $\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\eta\eta$, and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\eta$ for $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$. The normal σ optative of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ is $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ for $\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\eta$, which, written as $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$, is found four times in Homer. So ambiguous a form could not continue to exist, and the language with the aid of the reduplicated $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$ produced in its place the inconvenient $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\eta\eta$ for $\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$ (*Iliad* xix. 209). But the termination was so cumbersome, that this form is never repeated.

The suffix $\sigma\eta\eta$ being, as I have shown, impossible after a consonant, and $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ ($\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$) being put aside as overweighing the termination, the language chose to use after stems ending in a consonant a lighter form of $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$, viz. $\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ for $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$, restricted, like $\sigma\eta\eta$ and $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta$, to the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons singular and to the 3rd person plural. The connexion of this $\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ with $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta$ has been often discussed, especially with reference to the final α . The following explanation, I believe, meets the difficulty. On the one hand we have in the optative the strong suffix $\eta\eta$ weakened in the dual and the first two persons of the plural into ι , and on the other we have the weak feminine ι , which is found in so many languages, strengthened in Greek into $\mu\alpha$. If we combine the two couples, we get a series of three: (1) $\eta\eta$, (2) $\mu\alpha$, (3) $\acute{\iota}$. The intermediate $\mu\alpha$ is not a weak suffix but a lighter form of the strong suffix $\eta\eta$, and as such must in the earlier language have borne the accent. This results not only from the consideration that its use in the optative was confined to the persons to which under other circumstances $\eta\eta$ was applicable, but from the phonetic effect of the nominal suffix $\mu\alpha$ in shortening the root

syllable. Compare *πρόφρων πρόφρασσα, ἰὼν ἱάσσα, ἰὼν ἱάσσα*, and contrast the working of this suffix in the Homeric *γαῖα* for *γαῖα*, with that of *ā* in the original *γᾶfā*, the parent of the Herodotean *γῆ* and the Attic *γῆ, εὐγῆος* for *εὐγῆος*, etc.

If we assume then that *σεια* was a lighter form of *σειη*, but disregard the accent on the final *a*, as necessarily disappearing in historical Greek, the original inflection of this sigmatic optative must have been *πραξείαν, πραξείας, πραξεία, πραξείτον, πραξείτην, πραξίμεν, πραξίετε, πραξείαν*.

The 1st person singular has entirely disappeared, a circumstance which militates strongly against the natural view that it was originally *πράξεια*, for if that form had ever existed it would probably have been kept alive by the identity of its termination with that of the 1st person singular of the indicative, as *πράχθειν* was preserved by *ἐπράχθην*. But against *πράξειαν* there were two forces at work. The first was the general movement against unthematic forms constructed from stems ending in a short vowel, which though it has destroyed them in every case, has yet left traces of their former existence. Thus *ἰσκέδασα* implies a previous *ἰσκέδαν*, and *ἔθανον* must be a transformation of *ἔθανεν*. The second force was the preference of the language for a primary ending in the 1st person singular of the optative, as shown in *πράττοιμι*. Under the combined attack of these influences *πραξείαν* had to give way to *πράξαιμι*. But from the vowels of the substitute it is clear that the change did not take place until *a* had been recognized as the characteristic letter of the indicative *σ* aorist, and until *πράξειας* was on the way to be felt as possessing this characteristic. When the change was at last made, *πράξειας* and the 3rd person plural, *πράξειαν*, asserted themselves, at least to the Attic ear, as having the same terminations as the aorist indicative and were enabled to form in the same manner a third person singular in *ε*.

This feeling that the characteristic *a* was necessary in the *σ* optative inevitably led to the destruction of *πραξείτον*, etc., forms which Choeroboscus assures us existed in the early language, though no traces of them are found in any author. The recognition of *σεια* as a normal suffix of the optative affords an easy explanation of the desiderative participles in *σειών*. *Πραξείων* is simply the participle of (*πραξείαν*), *πράξειας, πράξειε*, taking the termination of the present as the

durative meaning of the form requires. The language was not averse to a connexion between an indicative in *a* and a participle in *ων*, as is shown by *ἦα, ἰὼν*, and *ἦα, ἰών*. If we accept this account of the desiderative *πραξείων*, it becomes clear why the formation in Homer and older Attic is restricted to the participle.

The main interest of the optative suffix *ια*, the existence of which I believe I have established, lies in its importance for Latin philology. The present subjunctive in Latin is plainly optative and potential in meaning, and when used independently corresponds to the Greek optative. All the forms on the construction of which philologists are agreed are plainly optatives in origin (e.g. *sim*, etc.). Now with the aid of the accented suffix *ια* there is no difficulty in constructing *dicam* as an optative. First by attaching *ια* to the thematic stem we get *dicoiam*, which by Wharton's law passes into *dicaiam*; and then after the necessary loss of the *i* and subsequent contraction we arrive at *dicām*. The prehistoric inflection on this view was *dicām, dicās, dicāt, dicoimus, dicoitis, dicant. Dicoimus* and *dicoitis* of course disappeared.

It follows from this view that we ought to analyse *stem* into *staiem* with the same strong termination that exists in *siem* and *στειν* (*στασιν*). The Oscan and Umbrian dialects supply evidence of this view of the formation of the present subjunctive in Latin. The terminations of the 3rd persons singular and plural in both dialects demonstrate that we are dealing with a secondary tense like the Greek optative, and not a primary tense like the Greek subjunctive. This point was taken long ago, and is made clear in the grammars of these dialects. As regards the forms themselves, the Oscan present subjunctive is identical with the Latin, *deicad* with *dicat* and *deicans* with *dicant*, the *d* and *ns* being the dialectic indication of a secondary ending. The next instance seems to me conclusive. The present subjunctive *deivaed*, which stands for *deivaed* (cf. Planta, p. 90) corresponds exactly to *stæt* (from *staiem*), the immediate parent of *stet*. The Umbrian present subjunctive of the first conjugation is obviously formed with the suffix *ια*, e.g. *kuraio* = Latin *curet*. But no argument can be founded on these forms till a satisfactory account is given of the retention of *i*. I will treat of this question more fully when the time comes to discuss the Latin subjunctive as a whole.

FRED. W. WALKER.

PYLOS AND SPHAKTERIA.

IN the number of the *Journal* of the Hellenic Society, April 1896 (published September 1896), are two papers on Pylos and Sphakteria, one by Mr. Burrows and one by myself. The arrangements for publishing mine in the *Journal* were made before Mr. Burrow's paper was offered to the Editors, and the latter very courteously asked me whether I had any objection to a second paper on the same subject appearing in the same number with my own. As it seemed to me that the point to be aimed at was historical truth and not the successful advocacy of individual views on the subject, I had no objection whatever to the course suggested, but I stipulated that Mr. Burrows should not see what I had written, and of course that I should not see his paper. An opportunity of comparing our ideas was, however, afforded us in a discussion which followed the reading of a paper on the subject by me at a meeting of the Society last spring, when Mr. Burrows criticised some of the views I had expressed. I confess that I did not feel that the discussion was wholly satisfactory. It was, perhaps, inevitable that Mr. Burrows, in criticising a somewhat rapidly read paper, should have misapprehended in certain important respects what I had actually said, and I see now that I also was mistaken as to the line he adopted on several points of interest and importance. I need hardly say that I have looked forward to the publication of his paper with the greatest interest. It would have been little short of a miracle had our views on so difficult and complicated a subject corresponded in all respects, but I am glad to find that on the two main points, as well as on several minor but important ones, we are emphatically in agreement. At the same time I think that it may be of use to those who are interested in the subject if I speak briefly of the points of difference which exist in the views we have expressed. I will put the matter as briefly as possible, and take the questions in the order in which I find them in Mr. Burrows' paper.

The pages referred to are those of Mr. Burrows' article in the *Hellenic Journal*.

1. *The identity of Pylos and Sphakteria* (pp. 56, 58).

We are both agreed that Palaeokastro = Pylos and Sphagia = Sphakteria, and that the alternative identification given in Arnold's note cannot be supported.

2. *The παλαιὸν ἔργον mentioned by Thucydides*, iv. 31, 2 (pp. 58, 59).

There can be no doubt as to its position on the summit peak at the north end of Sphagia. On this point we could hardly fail to be in agreement. I am not so certain as Mr. Burrows as to the existent traces of it, and I did not see the piece of wall 3 ft. 6 in. high to which Mr. Burrows refers. The stratification of the limestone on Sphagia, which is much of it vertical or nearly so, is deceptive, and has to be treated with extreme caution. The summit hill was so excellent a point for purposes of survey that I was at work there three or four times, and ascended it from both north and south and also from the east along the short ridge. I looked for traces of the work, and though I saw nothing which could to my mind be identified with certainty with such traces, yet I think that Mr. Burrows' evidence, supporting that of Dr. Schliemann, appears to be fairly convincing on this point.

3. *The path taken by the Messenian captain and his band*.

I cannot help thinking that Mr. Burrows has, in dealing with this part of his subject, attempted to prove too much. Modern topography can do much for the elucidation of that which is obscure in ancient history, but it is possible to carry it too far, and in this case I think Mr. Burrows has erred. We are apparently agreed that the Messenians made their way into the hollow on the east side of the summit. Mr. Burrows thinks they made their way up a gully. If I remember that gully aright it is more of the nature of what Alpine climbers call, I believe, a 'chimney,' than of the kind of thing which we associate with the word gully. Climable it would be no doubt to an unimpeded and experienced mountaineer, but as the path taken by the Messenians it is improbable. There is the further improbability of its being in the same condition at the present day, after the wear and tear of 2,000 years, as at the time at which the event took place. Moreover Mr. Burrows admits that to arrive at the bottom of it the Messenian band must have re-embarked (p. 61 *ad fin.*). How is it that Thucydides in his detailed account of the exploit not only does not mention this point, but expressly says that the Messenian captain and his band ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς ὁμήσας ὥστε μὴ ἰδεῖν ἐκείνους, κατὰ τὸ ἀεὶ παρέικον τοῦ κρημνώδους

τῆς νήσου προσβαίνων, καὶ ἢ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι χωρίου ἰσχύϊ πιστεύσαντες οὐκ ἐφύλασσον, &c. ? They certainly could not have got down the cliff to the bottom, nor could they have started from the Panagia and made their way along the water side. I think myself that the only possible explanation of the course taken is that they got into the hollow from the south end of it, starting from some point on the cliffs well away behind the line of assailants, and making their way along the cliff just below its topmost edge, where it is not perpendicular, but where their path would be hidden from the Spartan force on Mount St. Elias, and thence within the ring of defenders. I certainly do not think that we can determine more than this.

4. *The fortifications of Pylos (Palaeo-Kastro).*

Before discussing Mr. Burrows' determination of the position of the Athenian fortifications on Pylos, I must point out that one or two assertions which he makes are contrary to the evidence which is obtainable at the present day.

A. *The south-east corner of Pylos (p. 64).*

He says that the east cliff lasts to within 100 yards of the Sikia channel on the south, and therefore that this 100 yards must have required artificial defence. In the first place this cliff is 60 feet high within 50 yards of the Sikia, and 90 feet high within a hundred, and it abuts on the channel itself in a very steep-ended buttress. If my measurements be disputed, let me refer to the pictures which accompany Mr. Burrows' paper. They do exaggerate in favour of my assertion, but they give a fairly accurate picture of the actual contour of that end of the cliff. But, furthermore, as I had occasion to notice in taking measurements for the contouring, the south portion of the east cliff gives evidence of having been washed by deep water at a much more recent period than the north end, and also the state of the sand-bar shows that the last open outlet of the lagoon was at the end right under that cliff. If this be so a land force could not have attacked this south end of the cliff even had it been, militarily speaking, climbable, which it is not.

B. *The north part of the east cliff (p. 64).*

Mr. Burrows says that this cliff lasts to within a 'few hundred' yards of the Voithio Kilia on the north. Referring to measurements I find that within 180 yards of the Voithio Kilia this cliff is 90 feet high, the greater part of which is perpendicular. Then comes a gap of 100 yards or more, where there is no cliff, but a steep slope on to the

sand hills by the Voithio Kilia, and then over the Voithio Kilia itself is a cliff not more than 30 feet high, but absolutely perpendicular. From the mountaineer's point of view the cliff is not unscaleable, but for practical military purposes it is so, and the notorious incompetence of the Lacedaemonians in the assault of strongly defended positions emphasises the impracticability in the case under consideration. Did Demosthenes choose the east cliff as his line of defence from the land side, he had practically to provide for the defence of the break in the cliffs, and for little more.

C. *The defence on the land side.*

In accordance with the view Mr. Burrows has taken of the east cliff he would place the northern defence on the line of the cliff which stands high on the north slope of Pylos, continued to the sea on the west by a line of wall whose remains, he says, still exist. There is a wall there. It will be found marked by a black line on my general map (Plate III.). Mr. Burrows, in consideration of its position and style of building, identifies it with apparent confidence with the actual wall built by the Athenian defenders of Pylos. I do not know what this may seem to others who are acquainted with the history of this site, but to me, at least, this identification seems like topography gone wild. The wall is, as Mr. Burrows describes it, more or less rough in construction, and, I think, without mortar. Let us consider for one moment what that wall would have had to survive in order to exist at the present time. There would be first of all the Messenian Pylos which Pausanias describes, which must have lain partly to the north of the wall, for the cave of Nestor is described as being within the city. The inhabitants of that city must have been sorely tempted to use existing structures as a convenient quarry, especially when those structures could have been of no other value to them. If they resisted the temptation they must have been persons of unusual self-denial. We will suppose they were, and that the wall survived. The peak was almost certainly occupied by a castle in the time of the Frankish dominion, of which castle certain portions of the existing remains are remnants. Still the wall survives, and the promontory passes eventually into the possession of the Venetians, who no doubt made the fortification into the form of which we now see the ruins. There were stormy times in south-west Greece in those days: continual attacks by and fighting with the Turks, and from old Venetian records and

maps we know that the place was besieged many times and at last taken by assault. Through all this the wall still survives. Can this be credible? Suppose it be pronounced so: still another possibility suggests itself. May not such a wall have been built by some of the later occupants of the site? Having the rough unhewn stone scattered about the neighbouring ground, what other kind of wall than the one described would any one have built who had taken into his head to use that material as he found it, were he Messenian, Frank, or Greek? We have thus two improbabilities both tending the same way. I cannot see that the sum of them makes one probability. There are certain well known distinctions between the characteristics of structures in Greece dating from certain different periods, but the distinctions are drawn from characteristics of a very much more marked kind than any which this piece of wall presents.

There are two brief considerations which I would add before leaving the question:—

(1) Thucydides' account would certainly lead us to believe that the whole of the well defined piece of ground known as Koryphasion was occupied by the Athenians.

(2) This wall to which Mr. Burrows refers is on a very steep slope, running down it, a position of manifest weakness in defence in the days of short range missiles; since an attacking party, especially if in overwhelmingly superior numbers, could while keeping the defenders of the upper part of the wall engaged, enfilade from the higher ground the defenders of the lower part of such a wall.

D. *The lagoon.*

Mr. Burrows agrees with me on the general question of the existence of this piece of water in some form or other at the time at which the events took place. After discussing several alternatives he seems to come to the conclusion that the lagoon was an integral portion of the harbour, and that the sand-bar separating it from the bay did not exist (p. 70). On this point I think he has failed to take into consideration the nature of the physical forces at work. This theory would seem to demand that the lagoon formation on this bay had either not begun or was in its very inception 400 years before Christ. The improbability of this is apparent on the face of it, and when we further consider the comparative smallness of the lagoon-forming forces in this particular region and the necessarily slow process of their work, we are compelled to reject the theory. We have not here, as

in other places in Greece, a large area of land which was evidently lagoon aforesaid. The plain of Lykos has a distinct slope of 1° (no inconsiderable fall), to the north shore of the present lagoon; and therefore in any assumption that the present lagoon was in its inception at any particular time, we have to assume that the process of formation was also in its inception in this neighbourhood at that time, a practically impossible assumption under the circumstances in consideration.

E. *The breadth of the southern entrance of the bay.*

On this point we are practically in agreement.

F. *The blocking of the channels.*

Mr. Burrows' theory as to the nature of Thucydides' mistake is ingenious, but it is an hypothesis founded on an hypothesis, and therefore cannot be discussed. At the same time I do not see how he can make the theory square with his belief that Thucydides had visited the region.

G. *The length of Sphakteria.*

Mr. Burrows would ascribe Thucydides' mistake to a textual corruption. I think the topographical explanation is more probable as being founded on the intrinsic evidence of Thucydides' own account.

H. *Had Thucydides ever personally examined the region?*

Mr. Burrows thinks he had, and would apparently ascribe his mistakes as to the breadth of the channel and the length of the island to errors of observation. For my own part I think that a careful consideration of the topographical information given points rather to its having been derived from inquiry than from personal experience, and this would accord with the strikingly obvious method employed by Thucydides in getting information with regard to the siege of Plataea. He had certainly never examined that site, though it lay within a day's journey of Athens. I think, too, that many of those who study Thucydides' history will agree with me that he does not in his works present himself to us as the kind of man who would be likely to make mistakes of such magnitude after personal examination of the theatre of events.

I have tried to be fair in this statement of differences, I hope I have succeeded in being so. I think such differences are inseparable from the difference of the methods, observation in the one instance, survey in the other, employed by Mr. Burrows and myself. I am afraid that the magnitude of the errors to which my own unaided

observation is liable, as proved by the hard facts of actual measurement, has made me somewhat prejudiced in favour of the use of instruments. But in any case it has been very instructive to me to read Mr.

Burrows' valuable paper, and I cannot but welcome it as a real contribution to what is to me a subject of great interest.

G. B. GRUNDY.

NOTE ON EURIPIDES'S *ALCESTIS*.

Vv. 282-289.

ἐγὼ σὲ πρὸς βεύουσα κἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς
ψυχῆς καταστήσασα φῶς τόδ' εἰσορᾶν
θνήσκω, παρὸν μοι μὴ θανεῖν ὑπὲρ σέθεν
ἀλλ' ἄνδρα τε σχεῖν Θεσσαλῶν ὃν ἤθελον
καὶ δῶμα ναίειν ὀλβιον τυραννίδι
οὐκ ἠθέλησα ζῆν ἀποσπασθεῖσα σοῦ
ἐν πασὶν ὀρφανοῖσιν οὐδ' ἐφεισάμην,
ἥβης ἔχουσα δῶρ', ἐν οἷς ἑτερπόμην.

The difficulty in this passage begins with v. 285. It will not do to supply, with Monk, παρὸν μοι from v. 284, or, with Hermann, to make ἀλλ' connect only the infinitives. Lenting's κοῦκ for οὐκ in v. 287 and Kirchhoff's οὐδ' in the same place do not satisfy; nor has M. Weil helped the passage by writing in v. 284 θνήσκω παρὸν δὲ κτέ. In order satisfactorily to treat this difficult passage we must begin with v. 284. (Perhaps I should have said that the difficulty, though not the obvious one, begins here.) It is certainly far more natural to take ὑπὲρ σέθεν with θνήσκω than with θανεῖν: that every reader of the verse must feel. But if we read in that way, we shall begin a new construction with ἀλλ'. The one word that interferes with ἀλλ' ἄνδρα κτέ. as a new sentence is the infinitive ζῆν in v. 287; and here, I believe, we have found the ἔλκος. Substitute for ζῆν the participle ζῶσ' (cf. v. 695 ζῆς παρελθὼν and Xen. *Anab.* 2. 6, 29 ζῶν αἰκισθεῖς) and all is right.

θνήσκω, παρὸν μοι μὴ θανεῖν, ὑπὲρ σέθεν.
ἀλλ' ἄνδρα τε σχεῖν Θεσσαλῶν ὃν ἤθελον
καὶ δῶμα ναίειν ὀλβιον τυραννίδι
οὐκ ἠθέλησα ζῶσ' ἀποσπασθεῖσά σου
ἐν πασὶν ὀρφανοῖσιν κτέ.

Vv. 291 sq.

καλῶς μὲν αὐτοῖς καθθανεῖν ἦκον βίον,
καλῶς δὲ σῶσαι παῖδα κεῖκλεῶς θανεῖν

V. 292 is objectionable in its traditional form by reason of the repetitious θανεῖν. This is best got rid of by accepting Wake-

field's φθίνειν (cf. Wecklein's emendation in v. 25). But there is another word that seems quite as clearly wrong, and that is κεῖκλεῶς. Read the adjective for the adverb — κεῖκλεῖς.

Vv. 320-322.

δεῖ γὰρ θανεῖν με· καὶ τόδ' οὐκ ἐς αὔριον
οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴνός ἐρχεται κακόν,
ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ἐν τοῖς μῆκέτ' οὔσι λέξομαι.

Though I cannot feel with Mr. Hayley (*Amer. Journal of Philology*, xvi. i. p. 103) that v. 321 is right as it stands, I am becoming less and less disposed to regard it as a probable or possible interpolation. The simplest treatment of this crux criticorum seems to be the changing of a single letter so as to read

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴν ἐσέρχεται κακόν,

This had been suggested also by Johann Kνίçala (*Studien zu Euripides*, ii. p. 11), although (with a perverseness sadly characteristic of this scholar) he proposes as "das wahrscheinlichste"

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μέλλον ἐρχεται κακόν

For the μὴν in this position in the verse may be compared M. Weil's excellent restoration of v. 487 (ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀπειπεῖν μὴν πόνους οἷόν τ' ἐμοί) and his note thereon.

[Since this note was written, I have received, through the courtesy of the author, Mr. Hayley's *Varia Critica* (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. vii.), at the close of which he resumes the discussion of this passage. From this it appears that he is now disposed to regard μὴνός as unsound. For it he suggests νηλές.]

Vv. 360-362.

κατῆλθον ἄν, καὶ μ' οὐθ' ὁ Πλούτωνος κῶον
οὐθ' οὐπὶ κώπη ψυχοπομπὸς ἄν γέρων
ἔσχεν, πρὶν ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστήσαι βίον.

The word γέρων in v. 361 is due to the acuteness of Cobet (*Var. Lectt.*² p. 581). It is accepted, as I am glad to see, by M. Weil (whose excellent edition of the *Alcestis*, I may add, did not come into my hands until the printing of my own text was so far advanced that I was unable to adopt several admirable corrections of his). Cobet in the same place suggested that βίον in v. 362 was a gloss on φῶς that had ousted the original final word of the verse. This word, he suggested, was δέμας. The same conjecture was made by Nauck. Not satisfied with this I have kept the vulgate. M. Weil had done the same. I am inclined, however, to believe that Cobet's account of the origin of βίον is right. The key to the emendation of v. 362 appears to be given by I. T. 981 sq. καὶ σὲ πολυκώπῳ σκάφει | στείλας Μυκήναις ἐγκαταστήσω πάλιν. Read in the *Alcestis*

πρὶν ἐς φῶς σ' ἐγκαταστήσαι <πάλιν>.

Vv. 1118-1120.

ΑΔ. καὶ δὴ προτείνω. HP. Γοργόν' ὡς κατα-
τομῶν.
ἔχεις; ΑΔ. ἔχω. HP. ναί, σῶιζε νῦν καὶ τὸν
Διῶς
φήσεις πότ' εἶναι παῖδα γειναῖον ξένον.

To M. Weil is due the admirable division of v. 1118 that I have here followed; but the same scholar is not equally successful in his treatment of v. 1119, where he would read ΑΔ. ἔχω νῦν. HP. σῶζέ νῦν, καὶ κτέ. It seems unnecessary to change the traditional ναί. Why should νῦν have given way to it? Monk seems to have been right in giving ναί to Admetus. Hermann pithily says: "Recte ναί Monkius Herculi dedit: male autem scripsit νῦν" [for νῦν]. A careful study of the passage seems furthermore to demand that we read the words after σῶιζε as they are printed in Hermann's Monk's *Alcestis* (Leipsic 1824) and are reproduced above. The νῦν and πότ' are contrasted: 'keep now and you will say some time' etc.

V. 1131.

ΑΔ. θίγω, προσείπω ζῶσαν ὡς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν;

The ὡς is certainly awkward. Paley construed it with ζῶσαν, "i.e. not as a mere φάσμα νεπτέρων." But the following words are awkwardly definite. I have suggested an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction with both ζῶσαν and δάμαρτ' ἐμήν. But this is awkward. M. Weil in his critical note to v. 1129 quotes

Mekler's εἰσορῶ ξενάορον for εἰσορῶ δάμαρτ' ἐμήν and in his explanatory note on the same verse asks: "Le poète aurait-il répété ces mots au vers 1131?" The doubt is a fair one; but the difficulty in v. 1131 should prompt us to emend there rather than in v. 1122, the close of which seems quite natural as a repetition of that of v. 1126 (δρᾶις δάμαρτα σήν). Med. 1350 (ἔξω προσεπιπνέει ζῶντας) points to a separation of ὡς from ζῶσαν (so too does the position of ὡς), and Alc. 1124 may perhaps supply what we need. We may compare too Soph. *El.* 1452 ἢ καὶ θανόντ' ἡγγεῖλαν ὡς ἐτητύμως; Certainly the reading θίγω, προσείπω ζῶσαν ὡς <ἐτητύμως>; might easily have been corrupted to the traditional form by the gloss δάμαρτ' ἐμήν added to ἐτητύμως.

V. 1134.

ἔχω σ' ἀέλπτως, οὔ ποτ' ὄψεσθαι δοκῶν;

(best read as a question in view of Heracles's answer) should perhaps be corrected by writing οὐκέτ' for οὔ ποτ'. The same correction was suggested—not improbably—by Musgrave in v. 876.

V. 1143 seems to need a slight correction. Thus:

τί γάρ ποθ' ὦδ' ἀναυδος ἔστηκεν γυνή;

The importance of the readings of Codex Parisinus 2713 (a) in several passages of the *Alcestis* needs to be emphasized. Kirchhoff's judgment of this MS. was certainly unfair.

Vv. 433-4.

ἀξιά δέ μοι
τιμᾶν, ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ, λίαν.

The reading of a punctuated thus gives excellent sense and emphasis. (I may add that a spells τέθνηκεν.) Kvčala (*Studien zu Eur.* ii. p. 12) saw the value of a's λίαν but thought it in the wrong place. His suggested emendation (ἀξιά δέ μοι | τιμῶν (oder nach S τιμῆς) λίαν, ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ) is, of course, valueless. Nauck's ἐπεὶ τέτληκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θανεῖν, which I, rather rashly, adopted, is better than Usener's ἐπεὶ γ' ἐθνησκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μόνη, which M. Weil accepts.

In v. 546 it is perhaps unnecessary to call attention to a's τῶδε, which (in the form τῶδε) has won general acceptance, except in proof of the independent value of a.

In v. 811. a's reading

ἡ κάρτα μέντοι καὶ λίαν θυραῖος ἦν

(for the verification of which I am indebted to the courtesy of M. Henri Omont of the Bibliothèque Nationale) has been undervalued or disregarded since Kirchhoff's great edition. It is supported by *ὀθένειον* in v. 810 and, more clearly, by *θυραίων* in 814. (I still maintain the integrity of the traditional arrangement of vv. 809-815.) A misunderstanding of the irony of v. 811 with a's reading might well have led to *οἰκείος*. *θυραῖος* (which appears only in a of the MSS. recognized by Prinz but is found also in inferior MSS.) was printed by Lascaris and accepted by Matthiae and Hermann, though persistently rejected by Monk. Paley accepted it in his first edition but changed to *οἰκείος* in his second. Mr. Way in his translation accepts *θυραῖος* ("O yea, an alien she—o'ermuch an alien!"). Mr. Verrall (*Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 52 note) says: "The reading *λίαν θυραῖος* is clearly right: *λίαν οἰκείος*, the facile but pointless variant, is merely an unintelligent gloss."

A higher estimate of the value of a's

readings may well lead us to accept v. 1055 in the form

ἡ τῆς θανούσης θάλαμον εἰσβήσας τρέφω;

In v. 1140 *δαμόνων* τῶι κυρίῳ should probably be accepted with Matthiae, Hermann, Kvěčala (*Studien zu Eur.* ii. p. 38), Weil and Verrall (*Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 68 note). The variant is a guess like *οἰκείος* in v. 811. Kvěčala interprets rightly "der entscheidende *δαίμων*"—"jener, mit dem es eben Herakles aufnehmen musste."

Other readings in the *Alcestis* that appear to be rightly supported by a (not to mention the obvious *αὐτῇ* in v. 37 and *πάσῃ* of v. 1154) are the following:

V. 45.

χθονὸς κάτω.

V. 1049.

γυνὴ νέα (on account of the *νέα γάρ* of v. 1050).

V. 1117.

τόλμα' πρότεινε χεῖρα καὶ θίγε ξένης.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

NOTES ON REICHEL'S HOMERISCHE WAFFEN.

THE work of Dr. Reichel, *Ueber Homerische Waffen*, appears to me quite the most striking and important contribution to Homeric science that has appeared for a long time. It was reviewed by Dr. Leaf in the *Classical Review* in just terms of praise, and it is no intention of mine to diminish in aught the credit due to the author. But there are a few points on which I should like to have a more definite pronouncement of opinion.

First and foremost what is the relation of Homeric armour to the Mycenaean discoveries? That the latter have thrown a flood of light upon the former is indisputable, but are we to take it that this is evidence for a European as opposed to an Asiatic origin for the poems? Dr. Reichel indeed seems determined to observe strict silence upon this point, but Dr. Leaf's review might certainly lead one to suppose that he at any rate considers that the armour *does* afford evidence of this kind. Perhaps I am too much prejudiced in favour of Ionia; anyhow I do not see the force

of the evidence. A certain armour is found at Mycenae, the same is Homeric; it by no means follows that any part of Homer is Mycenaean. The emigrants to Ionia presumably took the old fashion of armour with them; in fact Reichel refers several times to the description of the old shield in Herodotus, i. 171, and Herodotus knew nothing of Mycenae. More than this, the very best description of the shield in question is to be found in Tyrtaeus, not Homer.

μηρούς τε κνήμας τε κάτω καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὦμους
ἀσπίδος εὐρείης γαστρὶ καλυψάμενος.
δεξιτέρῃ δ' ἐν χειρὶ τινασσέτω ὄβριμον ἔγχος,
κινεῖται δὲ λόφον δεινὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς.

See Tyrtaeus, xi. 23, and compare the whole passage, especially 35, for the *γυμνήτες* sheltering behind the shields. It is a perfect confirmation of Reichel and might have been written to illustrate him. The *θώρηξ* however appears in xii. 26. If the *θώρηξ* came in about 700 B.C. (Reichel,

p. 102) Tyrtæus would of course know of it, but he speaks in xi as if the *ἀσπίς* were the only defence. Among the conservative Spartans (Reichel, p. 59) the *θώραξ* no doubt had to wait a long time for adoption.

But not only is there manifestly no cogency in any argument for a European Homer that can be drawn from the armour; on the contrary there is some evidence that the Homeric armour is *not* exactly identical with Mycenaean. If Reichel is right the only Homeric shield is the enormous thing which approximates to a figure 8. But the Mycenæans have another form quite commonly; smaller and four-cornered. Why is there no mention of this in Homer? Because it had dropped out of use in his time, and therefore he is post-Mycenaean. Such is the natural conclusion to draw, and yet I do not wish to draw it, for arguments of this kind are utterly inconclusive. In fact it is easy to argue that Homer is earlier than the latest Mycenaean art, for in the latest we find the small shield, horses ridden in war, and painted walls. All these things are un-Homeric. But it by no means follows that Homer therefore sang before the fall of Mycenæ. The Ionians may have been reached by these last developments later; they may have migrated in fact a long time before the downfall of the capital of the ancient civilisation. Again the poets may have consciously archaised, as we know they did in some points.

In short the armour proves nothing either one way or the other. It was not only Mycenaean but also post-Mycenaean, and therefore so far as it is concerned the earliest strata of the *Iliad* may be either Mycenaean or post-Mycenaean.

(We seem to meet the great shield again in Solon, v. 5 :

ἔστην δ' ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερὸν σάκος ἀμφοτε-
ροῖσιν,

'I stood covering both my shoulders with my strong shield.' Supply ὤμοισιν and compare μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν for an abbreviated phrase of the same kind with regard to the shield.)

(2) If there is one thing certain in modern criticism of the *Iliad*, it is the late date of K. It is a very extraordinary thing therefore to find that K. agrees with the *Odyssey* in knowing nothing of the breast-plate (Reichel, p. 86), just as it agrees with it linguistically, and that it is the sole positive authority for leathern helmets, which according to Reichel are the

most ancient (p. 117). It seems that these two peculiarities of K must be due to accident, and this is a warning to be very careful in drawing any inferences about date from such details as these. It does seem however a necessary inference that the metal breast-plate was not in common use when K was composed, and therefore that K existed already before or about 700 B.C. (Reichel, p. 102). This agrees pretty nearly with the opinion of Professor Wilamowitz. 'In dieser Zeit,' (beginning of seventh century), says Reichel, 'muss die Ilias im ganzen in der uns geläufigen Form abgeschlossen oder so gut wie abgeschlossen gewesen sein.' Nothing but interpolations can be allowed for any later, no rehandling of the main lines of the poem.

Why then was the metal breast-plate not introduced into the *Odyssey* by interpolation, as it has been in the *Iliad*? The answer is ready to hand: because the *Odyssey* was so much less popular. That there is abundance of interpolations here also in the shape of single lines and short scraps cannot be denied; but if they had been as numerous as they are in the *Iliad* the chances are great that we should have had a *θώραξ* thrust in somewhere, for as Reichel observes there are many passages where we should expect it mentioned.

A very important conclusion that follows from Reichel's observations is that the *Odyssey* also was already complete by about 700, and may have been so a long time before. (Of course I do not include the lay of Demodocus or the second *νέκνια* or what follows ψ 296). It may be hoped that this will be the *coup de grâce* to the ridiculously late date assigned by Kirchhoff to the poem.

When Reichel says: 'Wenn, als die Verwandten der Freier gegen Odysseus ausziehen, gesagt wird

ω 467 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἔσσαντο περὶ χροὶ νόροπα
χαλκόν,

so wird diese Stelle schon dadurch, dass sie in der Odyssee steht, von Missdeutung gewahrt,' I find myself at issue with him. The line does not occur in the *Odyssey*, according to the definition of Aristarchus, at all. And though I have no interest in bringing even the spurious tail of it down to any late date, yet it is at least conceivable that the phrase here may imply breast-plates. If so however, they may be also implied at ζ 383 where the same verse is found again. More probably the poet of ω

repeated the line without any particular reflexion as to its meaning.

It seems that the funeral games in Ψ are later than 700 B.C. For there we have a description of the $\theta\acute{o}\rho\eta\acute{\xi}$ of Asteropaeus (who did not wear one apparently in Φ when he was killed) which Achilles gives to Eumelus. (Reichel, p. 97). This passage can hardly have been interpolated in the games after they had been composed; it is of a piece with the rest. The language of the whole account of the games, and the fact that they are themselves to be dated to all appearance later than the rest of Ψ and Ω , which again are themselves post-Odyssean, fit in with this circumstance admirably; the presumption is that the games are to be placed after 700, if we may take that as approximately the date of the introduction of the $\theta\acute{o}\rho\eta\acute{\xi}$.

(3) I will raise a question to which I can propound no answer. The shield, it seems, was regarded as the sole defensive armour a warrior could trust to, and this was why he had no breast-plate. Why then did he wear a $\mu\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\rho\eta$? And why is it so very seldom mentioned? And why is it called a $\epsilon\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, η $\epsilon\phi\omicron\iota$ $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\rho\upsilon\tau\omicron$?

(4) The extraordinary account of the breast-plate of Agamemnon reminds me of the 'seven-headed Naga' of oriental worship. It is described in fact as coming from Cyprus, a site of Oriental civilization. The poet had, I think, clearly seen somewhere one of those curious representations of the seven-headed snake-god, where three heads on each side rise up round the central cobra's hood. See Tod's *Antiquities of Rajast'han*, vol. ii p. 718, for a very fine illustration of it; Ferguson also has pictures of three, five, and seven-headed Nagas in his *Tree and Serpent Worship*.

A 26, 27 gives an absolutely correct picture of it; $\kappa\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\rho\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\alpha\tau\omicron$ $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\eta\gamma$ $\tau\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\theta'$, $\eta\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\phi\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\upsilon\varsigma$. (This is another passage excellently explained by Reichel, p. 92 note.) The same figure re-appears in the Persian Homer, in the legend of Zahhāk, who however has only one serpent on each side of his neck, growing out of his shoulders, but they make up for number in other qualities, being alive and requiring to be fed with the brains of men. $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\mu\omicron\iota$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\upsilon$, $\zeta\omega\omicron\iota$.

ARTHUR PLATT.

ON SOME DIFFICULTIES IN THE PLATONIC MUSICAL MODES.

IN Mr. H. Stuart Jones's recent discussion of this subject (*Cl. Rev.* viii. 448-454) occurs the remark 'Is it not clear that in Plat. *Rep.* 398 E the words $\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ — $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\lambda\upsilon\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ are equivalent to $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\upsilon\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$?' A careful study of the whole passage will confirm, I think, this view, which is also held by Westphal (*Griechische Harmonik*, p. 198) and von Jan (Fleckeisen's *Jahrbuch* for 1867, p. 816). Even if we read $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, there can be little doubt that Mr. Jones is right; but $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ is in itself so obnoxious that Mr. H. Richards has proposed the excision of the whole phrase $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. It has not, so far as I am aware, been hitherto pointed out that the correct reading is that of the first hand in Paris A, viz. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$. This agrees also with the first hand in Venetus II, as I learn from Castellani's collation, which Professor Campbell has kindly allowed me to use. A trace of the same reading probably remains in the $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, of v , a manuscript which alone preserves the right reading in more

than one passage of the *Republic*. A and II are admitted by all to be the two best MSS. of the *Republic*, so that the authority of $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ is in reality greater as well as older than that of $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$. The Greek expresses in the most idiomatic way the English sentence, 'there are also certain varieties of Lydian and Ionian which are called slack.'

On the general question, there does not seem to be in recent English discussions on the subject (Monro's *Modes of Greek Music*, and the literature which it occasioned in *Cl. Rev.* *l.c.* and ix. 79-81) any reference to the article of von Jan's already cited, if we except Susemihl and Hicks' *Politics of Aristotle*, p. 627. Von Jan's article is the most careful, scholarly, and elaborate attempt which has yet been made to frame a theory strictly in accordance with the language of Plato, and although some of his speculations are probably mistaken, the principle of his interpretation has certainly not been overthrown by Westphal (*Harmonik*, pp. 209-215). In one particular, von Jan's theory approximates to Monro's, for he

regards the *χαλαραῖαστί* and *χαλαραλνδιστί* as differing from the *συντονοῖαστί* (Pratinas, *Frag.* 5, according to Westphal's and Susemihl's interpretation), and *συντονολνδιστί* solely in pitch; but he still holds that the four varieties Lydian, Ionian, Dorian and Phrygian were 'modes' in the strict sense of the term, i.e. differed in the order of their intervals. See the summary of the article in Susemihl and Hicks. In his somewhat violent attack upon von Jan, Westphal presses the kind of argument which has been urged against Monro, that Plato and Aristotle speak of the *συντονολνδιστί* and *συντονοῖαστί* as different 'harmonies' from the *χαλαραλνδιστί* and *χαλαραῖαστί*, and that he could not have done so, unless they differed in the order of their intervals. But it may be doubted whether this is true of Plato. He says that *συντονολνδιστί* is a *θρηνώδης ἁρμονία*, and *χαλαραλνδιστί* a *μαλακὴ ἁρμονία*, but we may quite well suppose that each of them is called a *ἁρμονία* not *qua σύντονος* and *χαλαρά*, but *qua λυδιστί*. They are the same *ἁρμονία*, only high-pitched in the one case, and low-pitched in the other. The case is much the same with Aristotle: see *Politics*, viii. 5, 1340^a 40 ff. Wherever he speaks of *ἀνεμένα* and *σύντονοι ἁρμονίαι*, he is (according to the editors) dealing with *χαλαραλνδιστί*, *χαλαραῖαστί*, and *συντονολνδιστί*, *συντονοῖαστί* respectively; and these are rightly called *ἁρμονίαι* as being varieties of *λυδιστί* and *ιαστί*.

If the principle of von Jan's interpretation is correct, Plato apparently recognises four leading or simple modes, viz. Dorian, Phrygian, Lydian, and Ionian (each of the last two having two varieties), and one composite, the Mixolydian. The name Mixolydian hardly allows us to identify it with *συντονοῖαστί*, as Gevaert does, but rather points to a fusion of two distinct modes, one of which was the Lydian. Von Jan (*l.c.* p. 823) is probably right in sup-

posing that *καὶ τοιαῦται τινες* in Plato includes the *συντονοῖαστί* among others.

The existence of four simple or primary modes, from which all the others were derived, appears to me to furnish a ready explanation of the much disputed passage in 400 A, *ὅτι μὲν γὰρ τρεῖς ἄλλα ἐστὶν εἶδη ἐξ ὧν αἱ βάσεις πλέκονται, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς φθόγγοις τέτταρα, ὅθεν αἱ πᾶσαι ἁρμονίαι, τετραμένους ἂν εἴποιμι*. The *τρία εἶδη* are rightly explained by Arist. Quint. i. 34, Meib. as *τὸ ἴσον, τὸ ἡμιόλιον, and τὸ διπλάσιον*; but what are the *τέτταρα εἶδη ὅθεν αἱ πᾶσαι ἁρμονίαι*? The following explanations among others have been offered: 1° the intervals of the fourth, fifth, octave, and double octave (Ast); 2° the four notes of the tetrachord (Stallbaum, Jowett and Campbell, the latter apparently with hesitation) 3° 'the four ratios which give the primary musical intervals—viz. the ratios 2 : 1, 3 : 2, 4 : 3 and 9 : 8 which give the octave, fifth, fourth and tone' (Monro *l.c.* p. 106 n.) 4° the four *ἁρμονίαι*, *Φρυγιστί*, *Λυδιστί*, *Δωριστί*, *Λοκριστί* (Westphal, *Rhythmik*, p. 238). Plato's language appears to me to be carefully guarded. He does not say *ὥσπερ τῶν φθόγγων τέτταρα*, but *ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς φθόγγοις* 'as, in notes, there are four *εἶδη*.' The *εἶδη* need not therefore be intervals or notes, nor is it clear, how four kinds of notes are needed to produce all the *ἁρμονίαι*; two intervals, those of the tone and semitone, or at most three, the octave (to furnish the limits), tone, and semitone, are enough. What then are the *εἶδη*? Why not the four primary *ἁρμονίαι* already mentioned, *Φρυγιστί*, *Λυδιστί*, *Δωριστί* and (not *Λοκριστί*, as Westphal conjectured, but) *Ἰαστί*? The same explanation is given by Prantl in note 116 to his translation of the *Republic*. Westphal's introduction of *Λοκριστί* is a mere conjecture, for nothing has been said of a Locrian *ἁρμονία*.

J. ADAM.

ON CERTAIN PASSAGES IN THUCYDIDES VI.

In welcoming with delight Mr. Marchant's notes on the sixth book of Thucydides in the July number of this Review, as a foretaste of his promised edition, I shall have every one with me; fewer probably will share my satisfaction in finding that they are notes elucidating the meaning of the MSS. text, and not more or less ingenious

attempts to substitute something else. We have had and continue to have such a mass of *Adversaria*, that comments of this kind are delightful to read. Mr. Marchant is gradually asserting his independence of Dr. Rutherford and is now 'nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri.' Having first imbibed a thorough distrust of the MSS, he

has now learnt the lesson, which Herbst, almost alone among the scholars of the day, attempts to impress on a generation which stops its ears, viz. that it is not critical acumen but perverse ingenuity to alter the text of Thucydides, until you have convinced yourself that it will not construe into sense, and that by careful analysis of the author's thoughts and language one can sometimes make good sense, where others have failed.

The first clear result of Mr. Marchant's notes, is that in no single one of the passages in question is any textual alteration necessary. I may say, that Mr. Marchant's views are to me convincing in some of the passages e.g. 21, 2; 46, 2; in others e.g. 87, 3; 87, 4 what he says is interesting but unconvincing, for the renderings adopted make good sense but cannot be said to be preferable to those quoted from Jowett. In a few of the passages I should like to traverse his view.

(1) 89, 6. The difficulty of this passage is well-known. If with Mr. Marchant to οἰδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον one supplies φρονολήν, this is, literally translated. 'I should be more sensible than anybody else, in proportion as I might abuse democracy.' What this comes to is that Alcibiades means 'By abusing democracy I should be more sensible than you my hearers.' οἰδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον φρονολήν means 'I should be more sensible,' not 'I should show the superiority of my insight,' for which one would require φαινομένην φρονών or something of the sort. For Alcibiades it would be a very natural thing to say, 'You would perhaps think me a more sensible person, if I abused it: but really it is unnecessary, for I quite agree with you;' but this seems hardly to be got out of the words. Herbst's explanation is much worse. He supplies ὅσω οἰδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον λοιδορήσαιμι, and translates 'in proportion as I should have more right to abuse it,' but οἰδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον λοιδορήσαιμι means 'I should abuse it better than any one else.' I.e. 'The more I should surpass others in the abuse of democracy, the better I should understand it.' Even for Alcibiades it is rather a startling thing to say that the stronger the language one uses about an institution, the better one understands it. Assuming the text to be sound, it seems to me, that one can only fall back upon Jowett's rendering, which certainly does not force the meaning of words as much as the two above mentioned. May I parenthetically express a belief, that if Mr. Marchant had made more use of the com-

mentary in Jowett's edition, as explaining and justifying the renderings of the text, he would probably have contented himself with saying elsewhere of Jowett's version that 'the meaning is invariably brought out,' without adding 'sometimes at the expense of the Greek?' The late master of Balliol, just because his primary object in the translation was to express the sense with as much force and point as possible, added in the commentary full explanations as to how he took the words, if ever the translation left room for a possible doubt. The note on this passage shows that he was translating οἰδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον (γγνώσκοιμι) ὅσω καὶ (μᾶλλον ἂν) λοιδορήσαιμι. The parallels adduced justify the omission of μᾶλλον. 'I should understand what it means better than anybody, in proportion as I should denounce it (or 'complain of it,') more,' i.e. than others who are not so nearly affected. It is easy to supply mentally to λοιδορήσαιμι 'as having suffered from it myself:' hence the comment of the scholiast ὅσω καὶ μέγιστα ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἡδίκημαι, which certainly does not compel us to suppose a lacuna. The word λοιδορεῖν is not common in Thucydides. Setting aside λοιδορία in ii. 84, 2 (noisy abuse by way of complaint, when one vessel fouled another), we only get it in two other passages. In viii. 86, 5 it is in the milder sense 'rebuke' (Madvig's λοιδοριῶν is no improvement), and in iii. 62, 1 the Plataeans, say the Thebans, λοιδοροῦσιν ἡμᾶς for our Medism, a change which is not denied, the form of government then existing at Thebes being pleaded as an excuse. Plataea certainly suffered from the Thebans joining the Persian side. If therefore A λοιδορεῖ a person or a thing more than B, the presumption is that B is not personally affected in the same way as A. Jowett's translation 'of course like all sensible men we know only too well what democracy is, and I better than anyone, who have so good a reason for abusing it' brings out this interpretation of the Greek with force.

(2) 69, 1. That the passage will construe in Mr. Marchant's way, is obvious, but the order of the words makes it preferable in my opinion to take καὶ as coupling οὐκ οἰόμενοι and ἀναγκαζόμενοι. On that assumption why should not both participles be concessive? 'Though they did not expect the Athenians to begin the attack, and though they had to defend themselves on the spur of the moment instead of having leisure to prepare, nevertheless they took up their arms etc.'

(3) 23, 1. In this passage Nicias is not

comparing the forces of Athens with those of Syracuse only but those of seven Sicilian cities, taking the gloomiest possible view. Certainly the Athenians 'could easily send a force of infantry equal to any force that Syracuse could put into the field,' but equally certainly she could not match the hoplite force of the confederated Sicilian cities. Nicias of course is practically saying, 'Unless you are prepared to do what is impossible, the expedition will be a failure.' Therefore, while admitting the possibility of Mr. Marchant's construe, I do not feel inclined to 'accept his explanation,' but prefer Jowett's rendering, in which τὸ μάχμον αὐτῶν is qualified by τὸ ὀλιγικόν adjectival, on the ground that it suits better the gloomy

tone of Nicias' speech. 'We must have a force to match theirs (i.e. of all branches of the service) and indeed stronger all round, though of course we cannot hope to vie with them in their total strength of hoplites,' and the implication is, still less in cavalry and light-armed troops, which was so obvious that it did not require stating.

87, 3. In favour of the translation of τῶν ἡμῶν ποιουμένων as 'our enterprise,' 'what we are doing,' rather than 'our general conduct,' compare iii. 7, 2, ἦν δ' οὐδεὶς κόσμος τῶν ποιουμένων, and viii. 69, 2, ἦν τις ἐνιστῆται τοῖς ποιουμένοις.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Cardiff.

MISCELLANEA.

SOPH. *Antig.* 673.

αὕτη πόλεις τ' ὄλλουσιν, ἧδ' ἀνασάτους οἴκους τίθησιν.

WHEN I wrote my note 'on a Virgilian idiom' (*Journal of Philology*, No. 47) and defended the above reading, it had not occurred to me that the tolerably common construction of οὔτε followed by οὐ is essentially the same; see e.g. *Antig.* 249, *O.C.* 972. There is indeed some difference, for οὔτε—οὐ does not represent οὔτε—καί, whereas αὕτη πόλεις τ' ὄλλουσιν, ἧδ' does represent αὕτη πόλεις τ' ὄλλουσι καί. But the repetition of οὐ without any particle to correspond to τε is obviously very similar to the 'Virgilian idiom.' However when I rashly suggested that there might be only one example of the idiom extant in Greek, I was certainly mistaken. There is another in this very play, look at *Antig.* 296: τοῦτο καὶ πόλεις πορθεῖ, τόδ' ἄνδρας ἐξάνιστησιν δόμων. Is it not plain that this means καὶ πορθεῖ καὶ ἐξάνιστησιν, 'both ruins and drives out'? Of course you can construe καὶ by *even* or *also*; so you can *et* in Virgil's 'Iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,' but when once the other way is pointed out it is difficult to believe that any one will not prefer it.

And this passage is particularly instructive because it is so exactly parallel to 673, the very words being all but identical. The special interest consists in the fact that as αὕτη is followed by ἧδε instead of αὕτη at 673, so τοῦτο at 296 is followed by τόδε, not by another τοῦτο.

NO. XCI. VOL. X.

A precisely similar idiom occurs in the twenty-second Orphic hymn: μήτηρ μὲν Κύπριδος, μήτηρ νεφέων ἐρεβεννῶν. And compare viii. 4.

Can any one throw me any light on this question? In English we often say 'I' meaning 'anybody you like.' In Greek this is excessively rare, but it is to be found. Demosthenes says in the third *Philippic*, § 17: ὁ γὰρ οἷς ἂν ἐγὼ ληφθεῖην...οὗτος ἐμοὶ πολεμεῖ, and in § 18, τοῦτον εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἐγὼ φῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς; in the latter of the two passages however it is not quite clear whether ἐγὼ means 'anybody' or only Demosthenes—I think 'anybody,' but cannot be quite sure.

In lecturing on this speech some time ago I was struck by the ἐγὼ and ἐμοί, which seemed to me strange. Is it a rule that when the first person is so used in Greek the pronoun must be put in? Unluckily such a usage is so rare that it is not yet possible to lay down a positive law about it. Thinking the orators more likely to employ it than anybody else, I have read the whole of Antipho, Andocides, Lysias, Isaeus, Dinarchus, Lycurgus, as much Isocrates as I could stand, and a good deal of Demosthenes, and have not met with a single fresh instance of it. Mr. Wyse however refers me to the *Respublica Athen.* included in Xenophon's works, where we have in cap. I. § 11, τὸν ἐμὸν δοῦλον—ὁ ἐμὸς δοῦλος—ἂν δὲ δεδίη ὁ σὸς δοῦλος ἐμέ, and in cap. II. § 11, καὶ δὴ νῆές μοι εἰσι, § 12 καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ταῦτα ἔχω. Unfortunately, in these places the

D D

pronouns could not be omitted without destroying the sense, so that they do not much help us; still here again the pronouns are put in.

That we should not have expected any pronoun as a rule is I think clear. I asked separately two of the most distinguished scholars living whether in such a case they would or would not add ἐγώ; each of them at once answered in the negative. Another however, Dr. Jackson, explained it for me in about ten seconds; 'ἐγώ,' said he, 'means *anybody, myself for example.*' What is perhaps a little strange about it is that ἐγώ here does not mark contrast between myself and some one else, but exactly the opposite; it insists on the similarity of myself and other people. Yet it must surely be to a certain extent emphatic, and in English one could not lay any emphasis on the 'I' in such a sentence.

Euripides, *Andromache*.

551.

οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔοικέ μοι
σχολῆς τόδ' ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἀνηβητηρίαν
ρώμην μ' ἐπαίνῳ λαμβάνειν εἶπερ ποτέ.

Surely Euripides wrote *ρώμην* με καὶ νῦν.
(μ' however is only in two MSS).

602.

Ἐλένην ἐρέσθαι χρὴν τὰδ'.
Qu. *χρή?*

1145.

ἐν εὐδία δέ πως
ἔσθη φαεννοῖς δεσπότης στίλβων ὄπλοις.

I have always thought πως miserably weak even for Euripides, but had not seriously considered it till one of my pupils translated it in examination 'as in a calm (after a storm).' This suggests immediately what I think Euripides said, ἐν εὐδία δ' ὅπως.

1231.

Πηλεῦ, χάριν σὼν τῶν πάρος νυμφευμάτων.

Is σὼν τῶν Greek at all? Read σοί, which might easily be changed to σὼν by a scribe who saw the τῶν coming after. τῶν σὼν Matthiae, which does not account for the corruption and makes an intolerably bad line.

Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*.

II. 15. οἶμαι δ' ἂν καὶ εἰ ἐπὶ πῦρ ἐλθόντος σου καὶ μὴ ὄντος παρ' ἐμοί, εἰ ἄλλοσε ἡγησάμην ὁπόθεν σοι εἴη λαβεῖν, οὐκ ἂν ἐμέμφον μοι, καὶ

εἰ ὕδωρ παρ' ἐμοῦ αἰτοῦντί σοι αὐτὸς μὴ ἔχων ἄλλοσε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἡγαγον, οἷδ' ὅτι οὐδ' ἂν τοῦτό μοι ἐμέμφον.

The construction of αἰτοῦντί σοι has naturally attracted attention. The simplest way out of the difficulty is to read ἡγησάμην again for ἡγαγον. It may be impossible to account scientifically for the corruption, but every one knows that utterly irrational corruptions do occur in writing out anything.

VIII. 2. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ τάξας σοι παρέδωκα ὅπου χρὴ ἕκαστα κείσθαι, ὅπως εἰδῆς ὅπου τε δεῖ τιθέναι καὶ ὁπόθεν λαμβάνειν.

If Xenophon did not write εἰδείς may I be condemned to lecture on the *Oeconomicus* a third time.

XII. 1. οὐκ ἂν ἀπέλθοιμι πρὶν παντάπασιν ἢ ἀγορὰ λυθῇ.
πρὶν ἂν λυθῇ Dindorf. πρὶν λυθείη seems to me better in every way.

XII. 17. καὶ τότε μοι παρατραπόμενος τοῦ λόγου περὶ τῶν παιδευομένων εἰς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν δῆλωσον περὶ τοῦ παιδεύεσθαι, εἰ οἷόν τε ἐστὶν ἀμελῆ αὐτὸν ὄντα ἄλλους ποιεῖν ἐπιμελεῖς.

For παιδεύεσθαι I think Xenophon wrote παιδεύοντος. I could perhaps digest παιδεύειν but not the passive.

XIX. 9. Πότερα δὲ ὅλον τὸ κλῆμα ὀρθὸν τίθεις πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν βλέπον ἡγῇ μᾶλλον ἂν ῥιζοῦσθαι αὐτὸ ἢ καὶ πλάγιόν τι ὑπὸ τῇ ὑποβεβλημένῃ γῇ θέεις ἂν ὥστε κείσθαι ὥσπερ γάμμα ὕπτιον;

Οὕτω νῆ Δία; πλείονες γὰρ ἂν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κατὰ τῆς γῆς εἴεν.

The meaning of the last words can only be: 'the suckers would be more numerous under the earth (than above it)' But that is not the question. We want: 'the suckers under the earth would be more numerous (if the κλῆμα is bent than if it is upright).' Read therefore οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ κατὰ τῆς γῆς.

In VII. 21 is a curious idiom which I do not remember to have seen noticed anywhere. στεγνῶν δὲ δέεται καὶ ἡ τῶν νεογνῶν τέκνων παιδοτροφία, στεγνῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ σιτοποῖαι δέονται. That is to say that καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς ἐναγείς τούτους ἤλασε δὲ καὶ Κλεομένης. And hence we may defend the opening lines of Theocritus:

ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἃ πίτυς αἶπολε τήνα
ἃ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίοδεταί, ἀδὺ δὲ καὶ τὴ
συρλίδες,

where καλὰ has been ingeniously and prettily (but I think wrongly) suggested for καὶ ἃ.

ARTHUR PLATT.

NOTE ON HORACE, *OD.* I. 7.

THE thought expressed in verses 1-14 is different from that given in the succeeding stanzas. This abrupt change of subject led some of the ancient critics to think that this poem consisted of two independent odes, joined by an error of the copyists. Kiessling (*Hor. Oden und Epoden*, p. 53), however, is right when he says that the words 'seu te fulgentia signis castra tenent seu densa tenebit Tiburis umbra tui' form a bridge connecting the one part of the ode with the other. But the relation of these two parts given by him seems to me not congruent with the laws of logic. In explaining the argument of the poem he connects the first part with the second by a causal particle: 'Moegen die Einen Asiens gefeierte Städte preisen oder des Apollo heilige Stätten: andere in endloser Dichtung die Stadt der Pallas, jener nur auf Junos Preis bedacht Argos und Mykenae feiern: mir hat nichts in der Fremde, weder Lakedaemon noch Larissa, solchen Eindruck gemacht, wie der heimischen Albunea Grotte und des Anio Rauschen (1-14. *Drum*, wie der regnerische Notus ja auch zur Abwechslung öfters die Wolken verscheucht, so beherzige auch Du, Plankus, die Lehre, dass man des Lebens Plagen im Weine begraben müsse, sei es im Waffenglanz des Lagers, sei es künftig in deinem Tibur (15-21). Hat ja auch Teuker, als er eben heimgekehrt vor dem Zorn des Vaters wieder in die Ferne ziehen musste, mit seinen Genossen den Schmerz im Weine zu bannen gewusst (21-32).' But I cannot see how the fact, that Tibur is the dearest place in the world to Horace, can be a *causa bibendi* to Plancus. Besides Kiessling himself confesses that he does not know what

the story of Teucer, who is held up to Plancus as an example, has to do with the situation of the latter.

All these difficulties are obviated by assuming that the poet means to place the words 'seu te fulgentia signis castra tenent seu densa tenebit Tiburis umbra tui' in a sharp contrast to the thought of the preceding stanzas: Tibur, he meant to say, is to me the dearest place in the world. But whether you are in the field of battle or in your shady Tibur, wine must drown the troubles of your life.

The situation is presumably this. Plancus is in the army. We can see that from the change of 'tenent' and 'tenebit.' The cause of his melancholy becomes clear from the comparison of him with Teucer. Plancus has probably gone away from his Tibur with the same reluctance as Teucer departed from his lately regained home. If this Plancus, as Kiessling supposes, was Munatius Plancus, the former legate of Caesar and follower of Antonius, he was an elderly man, who had passed a stormy life and might well have preferred to spend his old age in the rural repose of his Tibur. But unknown circumstances, perhaps the will of the emperor, lead him again to take arms unwillingly. Horace tries to console his discontented friend, and this is the meaning of his words: I can readily appreciate your sorrow. For me, too, there is no place in the world so precious as Tibur. But in Tibur, as well as in the army, wine must banish the cares of your life. Teucer being in a similar situation has set us the example.

HEINRICH LUTZ.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

NOTE ON STRABO, IX. 1. 16 (p. 396).

So frequently do modern writers state that Polemo (apud Strab. p. 396) gave the number of the Athenian demes in his time as one hundred and seventy-four, that I was surprised the other day to find that we have no right whatever to father any such statement on Polemo. Only to mention a few of the places where this error occurs, I may refer to Grote's *History*, ch. 31, Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, s. v. Demus, Sandys on *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, ch. 21, § 4, and Kenyon

ad loc., while Prof. Case, in his *Materials for the History of the Athenian Democracy*, actually quotes as follows: Πολέμων δ' ὁ περιηγητής... Ἐλευσινὰ τε εἰπὼν κ.τ.λ. ! Though the error does not occur in e.g. Stein on Herodotus, v. 69, and doubtless many other authorities, it seems worth while to point out what Strabo actually does say. 'On the rock is the Hieron of Athena, i.e. the ancient sanctuary of the Polias containing the ever-burning lamp, and the Parthenon built by

Ictinus, in which is the ivory work of Phidias, the Athena. But (I will be brief) for if I once begin to describe such a multitude of famous and well-known objects of interest as Athens has to show, I shall be prolix and not adhere to the principle of my work. For I recollect what Hegesias says... 'Hegesias is, I suppose, the Magnesians mentioned p. 648, who lived early in the third century (Müller-Donaldson, iii. 53). The quotation from him is mutilated at the end, but the point of it is that he mentions only one interesting object on the acropolis, the marks of Poseidon's trident, only two or three buildings in the city, and outside Athens only Eleusis: it ends in a rhetorical flourish about Attica being the favoured land (or something of the sort) of gods and heroes, which is substituted for any detailed description of the wonders of the land. οὗτος μὲν οὖν (Hegesias) ἐνὸς ἐμνήσθη τῶν ἐν ἀκροπόλει σημείων (the trident-marks), Πολέμων δ' ὁ περιηγητὴς τέτταρα βιβλία συνέγραψε περὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἐν ἀκροπόλει, while Polemo filled four books with his description of the votive offerings on the acropolis. Strabo goes on τὸ δ' ἀνάλογον συμβαίνει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς πόλεως μερῶν καὶ τῆς χώρας. Ἐλευσινὰ τε εἰπὼν, ἕνα τῶν ἑκατὸν ἐβδομήκοντα δήμων πρὸς δὲ καὶ τεττάρων ὡς φασιν, οὐδένα τῶν ἄλλων ὀνόμακεν. Müller translates: 'Eandem vero rationem etiam de reliquis urbis partibus deque agro eius Hegesias sequitur, quumque Eleusinem dixerit unum ex pagis centum septuaginta et praeter hos etiam quattuor, ut dicunt, reliquorum nullum nominavit. Groskurd seems to take the passage in the same way 'ähnliches Verfahren beobachtet er auch bei dem übrigen Theile der Stadt und des Landes: denn nachdem er Eleusis als einen der hundert und siebenzig Landgaue (ausserdem noch vier nach Andern) erwähnt hat, nennt er weiter keinen der übrigen'; though he leaves it a little ambiguous, he certainly means, like Müller, to take Hegesias as the nominative to ὀνόμακεν. 1

submit that this is the only way in which the context allows us to take the sentence. It is only by the way that the discursive and rhetorical method of Hegesias is contrasted with the voluminous work of Polemo, and the person with whom Strabo is concerned, just at the moment when he is about to skip over Athens with a few lines and feels it necessary to apologize for this apparent neglect, is of course Hegesias. The theme was too great for details, thought Hegesias, οὐ δύναμαι καθ' ἕκαστον εἰπεῖν, and Strabo finds this sentiment a convenient one to quote, when—for reasons which we will not here discuss—he is passing over the intellectual capital of the world with so brief a mention. Who then is the authority for the one hundred and seventy-four demes? If Hegesias, according to the translations given above, the statement is considerably earlier than if it had emanated from Polemo. But I appeal to the unprejudiced reader of Strabo whether he would not rather translate thus: 'and while Hegesias spoke of Eleusis, one of one hundred and seventy demes and four besides, as the number is commonly given, he has named none of the rest.' Of course it can be taken as above 'he spoke of Eleusis as one...', but, as the context shows, Hegesias had no object in laying stress on the exact number of the demes, nor was it likely that so rhetorical a writer would indulge much in statistics; it is Strabo, who by the example of Hegesias justifies his own brevity, for Hegesias, though he might have mentioned one hundred and seventy-four demes, only mentioned one. ὡς φασιν is therefore perfectly vague, and we can only say of the number, that it was one, current in Strabo's time. It has been suggested to me, that the subject of φασιν might be Hegesias and Polemo, but this seems to me very unlikely, if I understand rightly the drift of the passage.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Cardiff.

FOUR CONJECTURES ON THE *REPUBLIC*.

IN *Republic*, iii. 396 E, where Plato is describing the style of λέξις which the good man will adopt, occur these words: οὐκοῦν διηγήσει χρήσεται οἷα ἡμεῖς ὀλίγον πρότερον διήλθομεν περὶ τὰ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἔπη, καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῦ ἡ λέξις μετέχουσα μὲν ἀμφοτέρων, μιμήσεώς τε καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς διηγήσεως, σμικρόν δέ

τι μέρος ἐν πολλῷ λόγῳ τῆς μιμήσεως: The words τῆς ἀλλῆς διηγήσεως mean either (1) 'the rest of διήγησις', or (2) 'διήγησις besides.' If (1) is meant, Plato states that the good man's style will partake in (a) imitation (b) simple διήγησις (c) the mixed style. See 392 D ἀρ' οὖν οὐχὶ ἦτοι ἀπλῆ

δηγῆσαι ἢ διὰ μιμήσεως γενομένη ἢ δι' ἀφοτέρων περαίνουσιν; Such a statement is cumbersome and unnecessary; for if the good man's style partakes in (a) and (b), it is necessarily (c). If by τῆς ἄλλης διηγῆσεως Plato means (2) 'διήγησις besides,' it is still very awkward not to define what kind of διήγησις he means. Read τῆς ἀπλῆς διηγῆσεως, and all is plain. The good man, says Plato, will use the kind of style which we described in connexion with the verses of Homer above (392 E-394 A). Now the style of Homer, Plato expressly said, is partly μίμησις, and partly ἀπλῆ διήγησις (393 C, 394 B). Therefore, he repeats, the good man's style will partake both of μίμησις and ἀπλῆ διήγησις. The common confusion of ἀπλῆ and ἄλλη is illustrated by Bast, *Comment. Pal.* p. 730.

In *Republic*, iii. 407 B, Plato is animadverting on νοσοτροφία, which is, so he tells us, a hindrance to the prosecution of virtue. Glauco agrees: ναὶ μὰ τὸν Δία, ἦ δ' ὅς, σχεδὸν γέ τι πάντων μάλιστα ἢ γε περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς ἢ περιττῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιμέλειᾳ τοῦ σώματος (sc. ἐμποδίζει τὸ ἀρετὴν ἀσκεῖν). In this sentence the double nominative is displeasing; and there is a further difficulty in περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς. The editors explain these words to mean 'going beyond the limits of gymnastic,' cf. *Gorg.* 484 C, περαιτέρω τοῦ δέοντος. But in point of fact it is not the desertion of γυμναστική, but the pursuit of γυμναστική in excess, which involves νοσοτροφία. This is clear, I think, from 406 A ff. Herodicus combined γυμναστική, i.e. the regimen of diet, life, etc., with ἱατρική, and introduced all the mischief, by making the δίατρα of invalids even more subject to self-denying ordinances than that of athletes in training. Compare 406 D-E. We have, I think, no right to take γυμναστικῆς in περαιτέρω γυμναστικῆς as 'legitimate training,' which is practically what the editors do. Read γυμναστικ<ή>, ἥς for γυμναστικῆς and translate 'the exaggerated discipline, which is responsible for this excessive care of the body.' ἥς sc. ἐστίν like the Latin 'cuius est nimia haec cura corporis.'

The third passage which I now discuss is in iii. 414 D, ἦσαν δὲ τότε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ὑπὸ γῆς ἐντὸς πλαττόμενοι καὶ τρεφόμενοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ ὄπλα αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἄλλη σκευὴ δημιουργομένη. ἐπεὶ δὲ παντελῶς ἐξεργασμένοι ἦσαν, καὶ ἡ γῆ αὐτοὺς μήτηρ οἶσα ἀνέκε, καὶ νῦν δεῖ ὡς περὶ μητρὸς καὶ τροφῆς τῆς χώρας ἐν ἣ ἐῖσι βουλευέσθαι, κ.τ.λ. If the text is sound, the double καὶ printed in spaced type must be taken (with Jowett and Campbell) as marking the correspondence of the two

clauses.' Precise parallels are however very difficult to find. *Thuc.* iv. 8, 9, to which Schneider refers in his *Addimenta*, p. 27, is certainly not parallel, as Classen's explanation clearly shows. Ast expunges the second καὶ, while Hermann replaces it by ὥς. I think the corruption lies in ἐπειδὴ. Read δημιουργομένη ἐτι. ἡ δὲ δὲ κ.τ.λ. and for ἡδὴ—καί, which is common in telling a story, compare *Sympr.* 220 C, ἡ δὲ ἦν μεσημβρία, καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἡσθάνοντο. This correction appears to me also to obviate the difficulty, if such it is, which Hartman (*Notae Criticae ad Pl. de Rep. libros*, p. 100) feels about δημιουργομένη, 'quod post πλαττόμενοι abundat,' since it permits δημιουργομένη ἐτι 'still in course of manufacture' to be taken as merely a descriptive adjunct. π for τι and ε for η are among the commonest of errors.

The difficulties of iv. 421 B are well known: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς μὲν φύλακας ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιοῦμεν ἡκιστα κακούργους τῆς πόλεως, ὁ δ' ἐκεῖνο λέγων γεωργοὺς τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἐστιάτορας εἰδαίμονας, ἄλλο ἂν τι ἡ πόλιν λέγοι. The sentence has been practically rewritten by Madvig and others, whose emendations are duly chronicled by Hartman. Unless I am mistaken, the text is sound, except in the one word γεωργούς. The meaning, roughly speaking, is: if we are making true guardians, and the author of the other proposal is making something different, he cannot, like us, be speaking of a city. Compare 422 E, εἰδαίμων εἰ—ὅτι οἶε ἀξίον εἶναι ἄλλην τινὰ προσεπεινέειν ὅ λιν ἢ τὴν τοιαύτην οἷαν ἡμεῖς κατεσκευάζομεν. It is obvious that the point of this rejoinder depends on the contrast between what we propose, and what is proposed by our rival. But 'farmers' does not furnish a proper antithesis to 'true guardians,' even if we assume that Plato is thinking of iii. 417 B and iv. 419 A. Mr. Richards suggests ἀργούς and (with hesitation) κακούργους. I once thought of θεωροὺς to suit ἐν πανηγύρει, but now prefer to change a single letter and write λεωργοὺς for γεωργούς. The contrast is with ἡκιστα κακούργους. Λεωργός occurs in the Memorabilia if not in Plato; and so expressive a word seems to me very apposite here. There is no harsh transition from it to the ἐστιάτορας εἰδαίμονας, for εἰδαίμονας is bitterly scornful: such 'happy feasters' prey upon the city and are scoundrels of the worst kind. They are the πόλεως ἀμολγοὶ described by Cratinus (*Meineke Fr. Com. Gr.* ii. 1, p. 140), by Solon (ap. *Arist. Pol. Ath.* c. 12 ad fin.) and by Plato himself in *Theaet.* 174 D,

συβάτην ἢ ποιμένα ἢ τινα βουκόλον—πολυβδάλλοντα: compare also Book i. 343 A, which suggests that ὁ δ' ἐκείνο λέγων is Thrasymachus; nor, indeed, is the objection of Adimantus anything but the dying echo of Thrasymachus' idea that the ruler is like a shepherd who feeds his sheep for his own

profit. They are those false rulers described by Milton who

"for their bellies' sake
Creep, and intrude, and climb into the fold;"

they care nothing for their flock, but only for the "shearers' feast." J. ADAM.

MACAN'S HERODOTUS.

Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books.

With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices, Maps, by R. W. MACAN. Vol. I. Introduction, Text with Notes, pp. i—cxx, 1—396; Vol. II. Appendices, Indices, Maps, pp. 1—341. Macmillan and Co., London and New York. 1895. 32s.

IN these two volumes Mr. Macan has furnished a noteworthy contribution to the study of Herodotus, and has produced a book which will be found indispensable to the student of earlier Greek history. For the text of Herodotus much has been done of recent years, and the question of the dialect if not finally solved, seems at least to be on a fair way towards solution. But there is another and a not less important side to the work. For a long period of Greek history Herodotus must remain our chief authority. Hence it is a matter of the utmost moment to investigate as far as possible the historical method of Herodotus, to trace the probable sources of his materials, to mark the various disturbing and distorting influences to which those materials have been exposed, with a view to determining how far the statements of the 'Father of History' can be used by the critical historian of to-day. Such are the problems to the solution of which Mr. Macan has applied himself, and we imagine that few will dissent from the general principles laid down by him, however much disagreement there may be in the application of them. The exposition of these principles occupies a great part of the introduction. Nowhere have we met with so full and so clear a statement of the case. In passing by it may be noted that the editor argues ingeniously from the symmetry of the work that the History is complete as it stands. There are some very sensible remarks on the travels of Herodotus, so far as they concern the three middle books.

The principles set forth in the Introduction are applied in the notes, in which will

be found many a shrewd observation on the probable sources of the narrative and the influences that have moulded the story. If the perchance and peradventure abound here, that is inherent in the nature of the case. Sometimes the editor seems to go too far. Thus in iv. 184. 12 it is surely better with Kallenberg to omit τὴν λίμνην than to make Herodotus contradict himself within a few sentences. The notes also contain a wealth of illustrations of the text drawn from ancient and from modern sources.

A number of the larger historical problems involved in these three books are treated in a series of appendices. In these many fresh points are urged which will have to be reckoned with by the Greek historian. The best is perhaps that on the battle of Marathon, where the whole material is passed in exhaustive review and a theory is formulated which at least has the merit of being intelligible and in fair accordance with tradition. We may refer also to the discussion on the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* which raises more questions than it settles, and to that on the chronology of the feud between Athens and Aegina. The least satisfactory is the disquisition on the Scythians.

Unfortunately there are some things in the book that call for mention of another sort. What reader is supposed to be in need of such information as that *διαπάσας* comes from *διαπάσσω*, or that *γενέσθαι* governs the genitive case, or that Peithagoras must not be confounded with Pythagoras? Any one who needs instruction on such elementary points will want much more information that he will not find here. On vi. 61. 6, it is remarked that *ποιούμενος* is the middle, but what voice except the middle could have been used here? In v. 108 it seems to be supposed that *νησὶ* and *τῇσι νησὶ* could refer to separate fleets and that *νῆες* might be applied to transports. In v. 93 *ἐπεμαρτυρόντο* is treated as a possible variant of *ἐπεμαρτύροτο*, which was suggested by

Reiske and has been adopted by several editors. In v. 33. 19 what has the quotation to do with the text? There are a good many other things of the same kind. In v. 25 note 1 *tyiya* is an error for *tyaiy*. In the Index *μηχανοῦσθαι* appears as the infinitive of *ἐμψυχανόω*.

In the text of Herodotus it is fortunately not often the case that the variants affect the general sense, and no one could have found fault with the editor if he had simply appended his commentary to one of the common texts. The present text professes to be taken 'not without corrections' from Stein's smaller text. How far the corrections go we have not examined, but since they were undertaken at all they might with advantage have been carried further. Why, for instance, does the editor write *Φειδιππίδης* when he always speaks of the man as *Philippides*? The guiding principle in the selection of various readings and conjectural emendations is not apparent. Many of the

best are passed by, while others of little or no value appear. As to the editor's own conjectures they are rather of the rough and ready order; does he seriously imagine that Herodotus would have written as he suggests v. 69. 7?

The question of the dialect is with perfect justice left undiscussed. Where it is incidentally touched upon, the problem is hardly fairly stated. It is not merely the MSS. of Herodotus *versus* the Ionic inscriptions, but the MSS. of Herodotus *versus* the poetical remains of Ionia. But there is no need to pursue the subject here.

After all these are more or less superficial blemishes which do not interfere with the solid value of the book, however much they may annoy the classical scholar who reads it. We trust that Mr. Macan will soon give us also an equally thorough discussion of the Great Persian War.

J. STRACHAN.

MONRO'S HOMER.

Homeri Opera et Reliquiae. Recensuit D. B. MONRO, M.A. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXCVI. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS convenient and handsome volume with its red and gilded edges contains, printed on little more than a thousand pages of India-paper of fine, perhaps even excessively fine, quality, the whole of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the Homeric *Hymns*, the so-called *Epigrams*, then the metrical fragments of the lost epics of the Epic Cycle, culled from Athenaeus and others, with the outlines of their arguments in the prose of Proclus, and lastly the parody of the Battle of the Frogs and Mice, that curious specimen of the mock-heroic, attributed to Pigres, the brother of Queen Artemisia of Halicarnassus. The inclusion of this last is perhaps the one point in the scheme of the book, to which exception might be taken. The piece is as little connected with Homer or the earlier age of epic poetry as the *Argonautics* of Apollonius Rhodius or a play of Aeschylus; consequently its appearance here may fairly be said to mark the extremity of gracious concession to a discredited, and perhaps never generally accepted, popular tradition.

The editor in his article on Homer in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* long ago expressed

an opinion to the effect that the exclusion of the *Epigrams* and *Hymns* from modern editions of the Homeric poems was an inconvenient purism, inasmuch as these appear to be 'the original documents, to which the narrative of Homer's life was afterwards adjusted.' The present work may therefore be regarded as the long-delayed realization of this opinion. The convenience referred to is certainly enhanced by the addition of the collectanea of the Epic Cycle.

With regard to the text, here adopted, of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* little need be said. The *Iliad*, as Mr. Monro informs us in his brief preface, is a reproduction of his own school-edition, while that of the *Odyssey* differs little from that of Dr. Merry in his well-known work. Such differences as there are arise from the occasional adoption of readings derived from the *apparatus criticus* of A. Ludwich (Lipsiae, 1889-91). The treatment of the text is therefore in the main eminently conservative, though by no means reactionary. The editor expressly disclaims any attempt to restore the earlier forms of the language, that is, to give us the latest results of modern criticism. 'Pristinam Graecae linguae formam aucupari nolumus.' Still he has not been absolutely unrelenting in this resolve. It has not operated so far as to prevent *ῥος* and *ῥῆος* appearing con-

sistently in place of the traditional εἶος (είος) and τείως (τείος).

In the treatment of the monosyllabic τέως and έως there is not quite the same consistent uniformity. In κ 348 ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἄρα τῆος ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πέοντο the old established τέως μὲν has been extinguished, as also in π 370, and probably no one would have grieved, if a similar change had been made in ο 231 and ω 162, where τέως μὲν is still allowed to flourish. Again in ρ 358 instead of έως ὃ τ' we find ἦος but in τ 530 and P 727 έως μὲν remains in undisturbed possession of the field.

It is somewhat surprising and a little disappointing that while in the two great epics κεδνὰ ἰδυῖα et sim. everywhere appear instead of the κένδ' εἰδυῖα of MSS. the same change has not been made in the *Hymns*, e.g. *Hym. Dem.* 195, *Aph.* 44 and *passim*. If it be intended that such forms should serve as an indication of the late date of the whole work, this object might equally well be secured by placing the later form in the foot-note without allowing it to disfigure the text itself. Moreover the weight of such evidence is enormously exaggerated, when these forms are silently removed from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and only left to prejudice our judgment of the *Hymns*.

However these are slight blemishes, and some may even think that they are not rightly so named.

The main interest of the volume for Homeric students lies in that portion, which contains the *Hymns*. We have here without much doubt the best text of these interesting relics hitherto produced in this country, not excepting even the magnificent posthumous edition by Prof. A. Goodwin, which in the main Mr. Monro has admittedly followed. He has, however, availed himself of the most recent work that has been done in the way of restoring the text from its numerous corruptions. We meet with conjectural emendations sometimes admitted into the text, sometimes, though less frequently, only mentioned in a foot-note. Along with the names of the earlier scholars Martin, Barnes, Ruhnken, and Voss, those of Hermann, Gemoll, Allen, Tyrrell, and Postgate may be found. A few of the emended and uncertain passages will now be referred to, and solutions occasionally suggested.

HYM. DEM.

55. τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων may safely be corrected τίς θεός, as οὐρανίων is certainly nom. sing.

99. Porson's φρεῖατι Παρθενίῳ is quite worthy of mention and indeed of acceptance.

226-7. Mr. Monro places a colon after κελεύεις, and reads θρέψω, κοῦ μιν. The comma should probably be kept with θρεψέμεν, οὗ μιν following. The fut. infin. occurs after ὑπέδεκτο in l. 444. The corruption may be due in the first instance to the copyist's eye passing from ΕΜΕΝ to ΟΜΙΝ. The vulgate is merely a clumsy attempt to reconstitute the resulting ΘΡΕΠCOMIN.

268. ἦ τε μέγιστον
ἀθανάτοισι θνητοῖς τ' ὄνειρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται.

This is worse than the retention of the unmetrical θνητοῖσιν ὄνειρ, which is at least Greek. The corruption is probably due to the intrusion of τέτυκται. The original would require no verb, but the later Greeks would not acquiesce in this, as many interpolations witness. I suggest:—

ἀθανάτοισι θνητοῖσί τ' ὄνειρ καὶ πολὺν χάρμα.

Possibly with Stoll ἀθανάτων θνητοῖσιν.

478. σεμνά, τά τ' οὐ πως ἔστι παρεξίμεν οὔτε
πνέσθθαι
οὐτ' ἀχέειν.

Read παρεξέμεν, not with the sense of *negligere* (Ruhnken), but of 'to divulge,' 'publish,' and οὔτε κοῖν, an old word not found in Homer, but suitably combined with πνέσθθαι *in parte accipientis*.

HYM. APOLL.

53. In spite of the multiplicity of conjectures, none satisfactory, the true reading is not far to seek. It is given in S the Vatican MS.

ἄλλως δ' οὐ τις σείό ποθ' ἄψεται, οἷδέ σε λήσει.

'But otherwise no one will ever have dealings with thee, and thou shalt know it to be so—thou shalt not forget thy isolation.' Cf. Ψ 326, λ 126, Ω 563.

It is not a little remarkable that the itacism of λισσει should have been so misleading.

125. χερσὶν ἐπήρξατο. Read χέρο' ἐπορέξατο. This elision is a fruitful source of corruption.

181. I could have wished Mr. Monro had

given us *περικλύστοιο ἀνάσσεις*. He follows the Moscow MS. in editing *περικλύστον* for the *περικλύστης* of the rest. The

Brussels MS. Γ has *περικλυστοῖο*, a very fair indication of the truth. The step here required is really no greater than that taken in l. 255 where the MSS. tradition is unhesitatingly disregarded, ἡ δ' ἐσιδοῦσα, in favour of ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα.

299. Mr. Monro happily suggests *τυκτοῖσιν* for the traditional *κτιστοῖσιν*.

402. *ἐπεφράσατο νόησαι*. Is not the true reading *ἐπεφράσατ' οὔτε νόησε*? Cf. note on *Hym. Dem.* 227.

487-8. We might read without much violence and with considerable advantage:—

ἰστία μὲν πρῶτον καθέμεν λῖσάι τε βοείας,
νῆα δ' ἔπειτα θοὴν ἀν' ἐπ' ἡπείρον ἐρύσασθε,

i.e. *ἀναερεύσασθε*, cf. l. 506 *θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο*. The similarity of *ἀν'* to the termination of *θοὴν* may have facilitated its loss. The hiatus *pace* Spitzner is not tolerable.

HYM. HERM.

48. Mr. Monro contributes *κατὰ νῶτα* as a suggestion towards the amelioration of this passage and would leave *διὰ ῥινόιο* unchanged.

103. *ἄκμηνοι* (Monro) seems far better suited to the sense than *ἀκμήτες* (Ilgen).

116. *τόφρα δ' ὑποβρυχίας*. Ludwich's *ὑποβρύχους* is without the slightest authority, though generally admitted into the text. The corrupt tradition may with greater probability be derived from *τόφρα βεβρυχίας*.

168. *ἄλιστοι*. Nearly all the MSS. have *ἄπαστοι*. B has *ἄπ στοι* which may be completed *ἄπυστοι* 'unheard of.' Hermes has no mind *agitare inglorius aevum*. He intends to be *κύνδιμος*.

224. Assuming *ἐλπομαι εἶναι* to be the original we are compelled by the sense, apart entirely from any question of the digamma, to accept Schneidewin's *Κένταυρον λασιανύχεναι*.

315. ὁ μὲν νημερτέα φωνῇν
οὐκ ἀδίκως ἐπὶ βουσὶν ἐλάζυτο κύδιμον Ἑρμῆν.

Perhaps *φωνῇν* may be left undisturbed (v. Mr. Monro's note) and *οὐκ ἀδίκως* read *οὐ χάδεν* (*ἐχαδ'*), ὥς, cf. Δ 24 Ἥρη δ' οὐκ ἐχαδε στήθος χόλον.

461. *ἡγεμονεύσω ἡγεμόν' ἔσσω*, cf. κ 361 *ἐς ῥ' ἀσάμυνθον ἔσασα*. See also Cobet *Misc. Critica*. p. 385, on Ξ 209 *ἀνέσαιμι*. The sense would be 'I will establish thee etc.'

HYM. APHR.

134. οἷ τοι ὁμόθεν γεγάσιν. Both usage and metre demand οἷ τ' ἐξ ὁμόθεν γεγάσιν. τ' = τοι.

151. ἐς λέχος εὐστρωτον, ὅθι περ πάρος
ἔσκεν ἄνακτι
χλαίνησιν μαλακῆς ἐστρωμένον

M *εὐστρωτον* in spite of the impracticability of ὅθι. The true reading can hardly have been other than:—

ἐς λέχος ἡστρωτον, ὅ περ πάρος ἔσκε ἄνακτι
χλαίνησι μαλακῆς ἐστρωμένον

194. οὐ γάρ τοι τι δέος παθείν κακὸν ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε,

A simple transposition of δέος and κακόν gives a satisfactory line:—

οὐ γάρ τοι τι κακὸν παθείν δέος ἐξ ἐμέθεν γε.

for which confirmation, if required, may be found in ε 347

οὐδέ τί τοι παθείν δέος οὐδ' ἀπολέσθαι.

Hermann and Franke rashly substitute an imaginary δέος for τι δέος.

252. I cannot think that Martin's *στόμα χείσεται* for the corrupt *στοναχίσεται* of the MSS., though adopted by most editors, Wolf, Hermann, Baumeister, Abel, Monro, gives an adequate meaning. Matthiae's *στόμα τλήσεται*, satisfactory in sense, is intolerable in metre. In neither respect is Buttmann's *ἀχίσεται* commendable. I offer *στόμα ἥσεται*. The later Greeks were not familiar with this form of the future of ἥδομαι, for which they used ἥσθήσομαι; but in the epic period we have a witness for it in ἥσατο, which is read without question in ι 353.

With the meaning 'my lips will no more delight to mention' no fault can be found, and we may compare the description of the anticipated behaviour of the goddess, ll. 48-9.

257. *νύμφαι μιν θρέψουσιν*. Perhaps *νύμφαι* εὖ θρέψουσιν.

266. *καλαὶ τηλεθάουσαι, ἐν οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν*. Mr. Monro places a period at the end of this line, after which *ἐστᾶσ' ἡλίβατοι* comes in very abruptly. The effect is not altogether pleasing. But what are we to say of Gemoll's emendation, thoughtlessly followed in Goodwin's text? We find in Gemoll's edition, with a fine disregard of metre,

καλαὶ τηλεθάουσιν· ἐν δ' οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν

with ἐν δ' Gemoll, ἐν MSS. at the foot of the page. Except indeed for the foot-note and his commentary we might charitably assume he intended to edit, ἐν οὔρεσι δ' ὑψηλοῖσι, which would serve his purpose well enough, and seems worthy of adoption, with perhaps Schneider's ἡλιβάτοις in 267.

284. For φασίν τοι we might read φάς μιν τευ with a comma only after κελεύω (283), cf. I 35 φᾶς ἔμεν ἀπτόλεμον I 44 φάντες ἀριστῆα. This is nearer to the ductus litterarum than Matthiae's φάσθαι.

HYM. DION.

55. διε κάτωρ. That an elision here existed suggests itself from the δι' ἐκάτωρ of M. Perhaps δι' ἀκάτωρ, cf. ἀκατος, ἀκάτιον, ἀκάτη. Lat. actuaria.

xxviii. 10. ἵπ' ὀβρίμης Γλανκώπιδος is not to be turned into ἵπὸ βρίμης with Ilgen. It is merely the strict grammarian's correction of ἵπ' ὀβριμοῦ Γλανκώπιδος.

Even if the later Greeks could accept ὀβριμος as an adj. of two terminations only, they could by no means retain the gen. in -οο.

xxix. 4. τιμὴν should probably be τίμον, cf. *Hym. Herm.* 528.

xxxiii. 16. ναῦταις σήματα καλά, πόνου σφισιν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες—

For σφισιν Mr. Monro suggests σβέσιν, mentioning other conjectures κρίσιν, λύσιν, σχέσιν. It seems not improbable that

κάλ' ἀπονόσφι περ

is the original expression, 'fair prognostications for sailors far away.' If the α of ἀπονόσφι were once misappropriated to καλά, the development of πόνου σφισιν is just what might be expected.

There is no call to prolong this paper with emendations of the *Batrachomyomachia*. Its literary value is small, and it is so marred with corruptions as to be hardly entertaining. Moreover all attempts at correction labour under the disadvantage of being in general too good for their surroundings, for example Ludwig's ἔδακον δ' ἔο (48).

Let me conclude by saying, that Mr. Monro's volume will be appreciated not only by scholars but by all book-lovers, et quantum est hominum venustiorum. At their hands it well deserves a hearty welcome.

T. L. AGAR.

ELMER'S PHORMIO.

P. Terenti Phormio. With Notes and Introductions (based in part upon the second edition of Karl Dziatzko). By H. C. ELMER, Ph.D. Boston: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1895. Pp. xlix + 182. \$1.00.

THIS is an adaptation, with additions, of the well-known edition of the *Phormio* by Prof. Dziatzko of Göttingen. The merits of the German original are well known, and need not be emphasized here. The introduction, in particular, is invaluable to students of Terence, and they have reason to be thankful that it has at last been made accessible in English. The character of Elmer's introduction is, in general, much the same as that of its model, and shows the same excellences. The text of the edition is printed in clear, large type, and furnished with stage-directions. It may be questioned, however, whether these are wholly an advantage, as

they cut up the text and make the scansion more difficult for the beginner. In many places Elmer has preferred a different reading to that adopted by Dziatzko. These changes are chiefly in the direction of a closer adherence to the MSS. (and to A in particular). In a number of cases they seem to be distinct improvements: in others they appear much less satisfactory. In the *didascalía* Elmer reads ATILIVS (HATILIVS Dziatzko, and so A in the *didascalíae* of the *Eunuchus* and *Adelphoe*). He points out that in A an initial H is often wrongly employed. But his statement (p. 155) that there is no real evidence that Hatilius was ever a recognized form seems too strong; cf. C. I. L., X. 8067, 11, *L. Hatilius Felix*. In the *periœcha* l. 7 he retains *eam visam Antipho*, defending the hiatus by similar instances from Plautus. This may be right: a grammarian like G. Sulpicius Apollinaris may have tolerated such a line, though

Terence himself would never have done so. But of Elmer's Plautine examples three (Capt. 24, 93, 31) are somewhat doubtful, as it is possible that Plautus wrote *Valeis* etc. (cf. FAAEIOI). In 86 Elmer reads *reducere* with Priscian, Donatus and the MSS. (except D). In 215 he reads with A *sed hic quis est senex*, while Dziatzko and many others prefer *sed quis hic est senex*. He retains 243 and 328, both of which Dziatzko brackets. In 423 he reads *iam ducendi aetas* with L. In 500 he brackets *me* as an interpolation. In 501 he retains *veris* (*verbis* Dz.), which is clearly right, as it is more forcible than *verbis* and is supported by all the MSS. For the substantive use, cf. *par pari* v. 212, etc. In 502 he retains *neque*, and explain *alia sollicitudine* as meaning 'some other (i.e. lighter) trouble' (so also Donatus). But Phaedria would certainly prefer that his misfortune should come at a time when Antipho was entirely free from troubles of his own, not when he was engrossed (*occupatus*) by some other trouble. Read *atque* (so Dz.) and the thought gains greatly both in force and clearness. In 598 he reads *ad forum* with the MSS. This may be right: but if so, it is the only passage where Terence uses *ad forum* in this sense. In v. 902 Elmer retains and defends (p. 164) the difficult shortening *verēbāmini*, which cannot be paralleled at all in Terence, and but rarely in Plautus. It is hard to believe that Terence ever wrote the line as it stands in A, especially as the Calliopian MSS. show variants. In 913 Elmer reads with A *eam nunc* (*nunc viduam* Dz. with the inferior MSS.), suggesting that *viduam* is a gloss on *eam nunc*. In v. 949 he retains *sententia*, understanding it to mean 'decision,' 'determination'; so that *puerili sententia* nearly = *inconstantia*. But surely one would expect 'childish lack of decision' rather than 'childish decision,' and *puerilis sententia* would scarcely be understood in the sense in which Prof. Elmer takes it without an explanatory note.

The notes of the edition are well adapted to their purpose and attain the 'happy medium' between too great conciseness and excessive length. I have noted here and there a few statements which seem doubtful or inaccurate. In the note on v. 5 *oratione* is rendered 'portrayal of character': does the word really bear this meaning? In the note on v. 170 we read: 'the present subjunctive is often used in the early writers where the English would use a contrary-to-fact construction. It was probably felt,

however, rather as a "less vivid future" condition than as the exact equivalent of the imperfect.' Is it not more probable that this use of the present subjunctive is a survival from a time when the form of the 'less vivid future' condition had not yet been differentiated from that of the 'condition contrary to fact in present time' than that the condition was felt as a 'less vivid future'? So in Homeric Greek a 'present unfulfilled condition' is regularly expressed by the present optative with *εἰ*, and its apodosis by the present optative with *κἔ* or *ἄν*: but this by no means proves that it was actually felt as a 'less vivid future condition.' In the note on v. 179 Elmer mentions Clinia, Heaut. 406, as a certain case of long final *a* in the vocative. This is, I think, right; Dziatzko says 'Heaut. 406 steht nach Clinia eine Interpunktion,' but the brief pause is not enough to satisfactorily account for the quantity. On 379 Elmer says of Cicero: 'Later he calls a man *subrusticus* for doing this (Or. 48, 161).' It is not a man but the custom of neglecting final *s* that Cicero calls *subrusticum*. 464, 'ecum: i.e. ecce eum.' The other derivation from *ecce* + **hum* deserves at least a mention. '644, *talentum magnum*: referring to the Attic silver talent worth about \$1100.' The Attic silver talent was worth much less (see Goodwin on the 'Value of the Attic Talent,' *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, 1885). In his note on v. 768 Prof. Elmer adopts Sandford's ingenious explanation of the words *ita fugias, ne praeter casam*. I think, however, the old explanation of Donatus (the first one) is simpler. The figure is that of a person running to his hut for refuge; if he in his blind fear rushes past the hut instead of turning into it, his pursuer will be between him and his place of refuge and he will be worse off than before. It may be, however, that, as has been suggested, there is a reference to a game of tag in which *casa* was a name given to the 'goal.' At all events, I should understand after *ne* a second *fugias*.

The notes are followed by a brief critical appendix, and this by an excellent bibliography of the literature dealing with Terence that has appeared since 1884. The book is well printed: I have noted a few slips, *clausula* p. xxxv., *πρόσωπον*, p. 78. In spite of some defects it is decidedly the best edition of the play now accessible in English.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.

HOMER'S HYMN TO DEMETER.

L'Inno Omerico a Demetra con apparato critico scelto e un' introduzione. Da VITTORIO PUNTONI. Livorno: Raffaello Giusti. 1896. 5 lire.

SINCE Ignarra, who published his emendations in 1784, this is, so far as I am aware, the first Italian contribution to the study of the Homeric *Hymns*. Professor Puntoni of Bologna, whose name is well known in connection with more than one department of philology, gives us a book of 165 pages at the low price of five lire, containing pp. v—viii a bibliography, 1—124 an introduction on the composition of the hymn, 125—165 a text with apparatus. The accuracy and laboriousness of his method, and the amount of useful information collected in a small space, render the edition in a high degree handy and serviceable.

I cannot however consider the book entirely satisfactory, and this in spite of its many obvious merits. The text and apparatus are, one may say without injustice, very slightly original. The personal contribution of Signor Puntoni is to be looked for in the introduction. The object of this section is to prove that the difficulties and 'incoerenze' observable in the poem are not to be accounted for by ordinary processes of transmission, but have their source in the circumstances under which the hymn was put together. This thesis is worked out at length and with great abundance of dialectical resource. Now there are, I hope, few scholars in this country, and their number is, I believe, decreasing abroad, who hold that it is possible by any process of pure literary and aesthetic criticism to ascertain an earlier state of a document which has been handed down for many hundreds of years in the form in which we have it; or in other words, that discrepancies or difficulties which are apparent to our judgment and taste are likely to coincide with or be due to deliberate operations upon the continuity of a text. The results of this method applied to Homeric criticism at large should suffice to persuade a candid observer of the uselessness of such ploughing the sand. Of all the literary criticism applied to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from Wolf onwards, what percentage of solid result remains? Except for the narrow corporation of polemicists, none; we are even now waiting on papyrus to give us the first data towards the history of the

prae-Alexandrian text. It is therefore melancholy to see Italian philology, in one of its earliest attempts upon an important classic, taking over from German method its least valuable element. The argumentation that in its natural vehicle possesses a certain hazy impressiveness, reveals in the lucidity of a Latin tongue its essential thinness and arbitrariness—not a fact at bottom, every proposition reversible. It is time that philology in its old age ceased this barren effort and banished the Higher Literary Criticism, interesting occupation as it may be, to the land of *ὄνον πόκαι*.

Accordingly I do not reproduce Signor Puntoni's list of inconsistencies, nor the portions into which, in obedience to them, he divides the poem. It is enough to notice how the industrious Wegener devoted as late as 1876 twenty-seven pages of the *Philologus* to the same purpose, producing, need one say, results entirely unlike. Signor Puntoni's text and apparatus form a more useful and lasting piece of work. The text is conservative, and free from the brackets and paragraphs that make the current edition of Hesiod, for instance, unreadable. Gratitude is due to the editor for at least not sacrificing his reader to his theories. Beneath are collected with great fulness the MS. readings and the conjectures of critics since Rubnken. Bibliography, which seems a characteristic of the Italian school of philology, is displayed here on a really great scale. Full justice is done to the early editors and critics. *Hermathena* however seems unknown at Bologna, else in Professor Tyrrell's brilliant review (xx. 1894) the editor would have found more matter than in all his shaft-sinkings in Mitscherlich and Co.; he has also neglected, with more justice, some notes by the present writer in the *Academy*, Sept. 1894, and the *Classical Review* for 1895. It is perhaps capacious to ask if this bibliographical fulness be not overdone. The least happy thoughts of unfortunate critics are exhumed and held up to light; most emenders count on a proportion of their *palmares* being let sleep in the cold shade of learned periodicals. Moreover, if each edition of a classic is to gather up the whole work done before it, to what size will these 'snowballs' grow? This is abuse of method.

It remains to notice the editor's contributions on particular lines. I shall be the briefer in doing so that I hope before long

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

to refer to them again when I print some notes of my own upon this *Hymn*.

The commentary throughout is disfigured by the unimportant detail of the words to which Eugen Abel in his edition was pleased to prefix a digamma. 10. P. alone of editors retains the MS. *τότε*, very plausibly. 12. P. prints Ruhnken's *κῳδεῖ δ' ὁδμῇ* for *κῳδῖς τ' ὁδμῇ*. Tyrrell's *κῳζ' ἥδιστ' ὁδμῇ* alone explains the corruption. The lines *καὶ ῥά οἱ ἀγγελέουσα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε* (53) and *σοὶ δ' ὅκα λέγω νημερτέα πάντα* (58) baffle this editor, as they have baffled his predecessors; in fact, they form the starting-point for his partition of the *Hymn*. But in a document that exists only in one copy are verbal difficulties reasonably to be ascribed to anything deeper than clerical transmission? 64. P. accepts with justice Ludwig's *θεὸν σύ περ* for *θείας ὑπερ* of M. 87. For *μεταναίεται* (unmetrical) P. makes his almost only conjecture, *μεταναίεσάν*; it was suggested by his *a priori* theory, and though inoffensive, hardly improves upon the usually accepted *μεταναίεσσι*. 137 sq. The editor prints what certainly cannot be construed *ἐμὲ δ' αὐτ' οἰκτεῖρατε κοῦραι | προφρονέως φίλα τέκνα τέων πρὸς δάμαθ' ἴκωμαι | ἀνέρος ἥδε γυναικός, ἵνα σφίσιν ἐργάζωμαι*. Either a mark to indicate that the passage is given up or a remedy is called for. 203. P. keeps *τρέφατο*, rejecting Voss's *ἐτρέφατο*, but the MS. reading introduces a caesura after the third foot. I am glad to see a lacuna after 211; this will also be found in the Oxford text lately published. Similarly with excellent judgment the editor restores the MS. *θρέψω· κοῦμιν κτλ* in 227. The abruptness is by no means intolerable;

on the other hand, it may be questioned whether the asyndeton of 237, *οὐτ' οὖν σίτον ἔδων οὐ θησάμενος· Δημήτηρ | χρίεσκ' ἀμβροσίῃ*, be supportable. Hermann's lacuna and supplement, *γάλα μητρὸς*, is a mild medicine. Neither 269 *ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖσι τ' ὄνειαρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται*, nor 284 *φωνὴν ἑσάκουσαν ἔλεων ἦν* are metrical; in the former case Prof. Tyrrell brilliantly suggested *ὄνειαρ κάρμα τέτυκται*, but *χάρμα* is well established, and Ilgen's *ὄνειαρ* seems probable by analogy with other forms. 328. *ἄς κεν ἔλοιτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐλίσθαι* is hardly tolerable; as above, either an obelus or a conjecture is indispensable. 344, 345 are very justly obelised. 364. P. keeps *ἰούσα* to support his theories; but *ἰούσα* is called for by the passage, and is a change so common in Homeric MS. as to be almost mechanical. The Higher Criticism should not need such weak supports. Tolerable justice is done to Mr. Goodwin's supplements of the torn leaf 387 sq., though Signor Puntoni's rage, appeased hitherto with rending a palpable document, becomes at this point, where it meets emptiness, acute. 403. The usual lacuna before *καὶ τίνι σ' ἐξαπάτησε δόλῳ* can hardly be dispensed with. 428. I am glad to see *ὥσπερ κρόκον* at last in the text, and *ἀχέιν* in 479.

I should be sorry to undervalue so thorough, painstaking and scientific a book; but much of philological science is falsely so called, and if the study is to maintain its place as a reasonable and profitable pursuit, neither unwearied *καὶ*-counting nor the chimera of restoration must elude the canons of common-sense.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

DE-MARCHI ON ROMAN RELIGION.

Il Culto privato di Roma antica. I. La religione nella vita domestica. Da ATTILIO DE-MARCHI, Professore. Milano, Hoepli. 1896. 8 lire.

WE have nothing in English that answers to this useful volume, and a translation of it would unquestionably be a boon to any one bent upon making a thorough investigation of Roman institutions. It is of course in the ordered domestic life of the Romans, and especially in its religious aspect, that we must look for the roots of the ideas and character of the people: it is here that a scientific study of Roman antiquities should begin. Odds and ends of Italian folklore,

hazardous interpretations of quaint survivals in ritual, speculations about the origin and meaning of this or that deity,—these may be interesting and even fascinating for the investigator, but they yield little or no result for a student of Roman history. On the other hand, whoever would study the power of 'religio' in building up the Roman state and empire through the agency of the peculiar character of the people, must begin his work with the religion of the Roman family. On this subject at least we are by no means ill-informed, and the available material has been admirably put together in Marquardt's *Staatsverfassung*. In his treatment of the

subject de-Marchi is content to follow Marquardt pretty closely: his object being, not to start a new theory or to dispute the statements of others, but to write a comprehensive account of what is at present fairly well ascertained. After a few pages on the relation of *sacra privata* to *sacra publica*, he proceeds to the domestic deities, —Lares, Penates, Vesta, and the Genius of the household. Next he treats of the forms and instruments of domestic worship: here are two interesting sections, one on the *lararia* and other sacred places of the house, the other on the 'family priesthods,' including the part played as acolytes by the boys and girls, which beyond doubt had great influence on the formation of Roman character. In the third chapter the great moments of life are dealt with,—marriage, birth, death, and funeral rites, and also festivals, auspices, purifications, etc. Lastly in ch. 4 a very large collection is brought together from the volumes of *Corpus Inscriptionum* to illustrate the private practice of making and fulfilling *vota*, and of dedicating objects to the gods.

Every attempt is made throughout the volume to bring it up to date in respect of recent archaeological research. The excavations of the last two or three years, e.g. at Narce near Falerii, at Nemi, and at the convent of St. Bernard, are all turned to

account. It is time that we in England should recognize more fully the growing excellence of Italian work of this kind, the admirable organization of archaeological research by the Italian government, and the advantage to Italian scholars of being continually within reach not only of collections but of the excavations themselves. No English student of Roman antiquities can afford any longer to work without a knowledge of the Italian language.

This is a book of facts and not of theories, and calls rather for a brief and hearty recommendation than for lengthy criticism. Every now and then however the author finds room in a note for a new view on some disputed point, and in such cases he is usually worth listening to. On p. 148, for example, where he briefly discusses the old crux of the chronological relation of *con-farreatio*, *coemptio*, and *usus*, he throws out the suggestion that the two former are 'due momenti diversi del medesimo atto, equivalente quella alla parte sacra e direi quasi della Chiesa di Stato, questa alla parte civile privata.' *Coemptio* is in fact the civil part of the ceremony, of which the religious portion was withheld from the later plebeian society. The suggestion is at least worth consideration.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

GRANGER'S WORSHIP OF THE ROMANS.

The Worship of the Romans, viewed in relation to the Roman Temperament. By FRANK GRANGER, D. Lit., Professor in University College, Nottingham. Methuen & Co. 6s.

THE title of this book is a little illusory. It contains no systematic account of the Roman worship, and after reading it twice I am obliged to confess that I have not learnt much from it about the Roman character. The author has evidently been greatly interested in the great works on religion and folklore, such as those of Robertson Smith, J. G. Frazer, Sir Alfred Lyall, and Mannhardt; and he has endeavoured to apply their results to the study of Roman religious antiquities. I trust I am giving him no discouragement when I say that this latter part of his work is as yet very incomplete, and that he writes with a confidence much too easy and lighthearted

about matters which may lead even the most careful scholars into quagmires. He has not yet, in fact, fully developed a conscience in the investigation of Roman antiquity. He has not learnt from the writers just mentioned that in this region of knowledge it is almost useless, sometimes positively harmful, to put out work which is not the fruit of laborious and often most uninteresting research. The mistranslation of a single sentence of Latin, or the omission of some detail in the study of a Roman usage, may lead to consequences of the greatest importance for a theory, and what is worse, may lead any number of other students astray. No more difficult or dangerous subject is known to me than the religious ideas and worship of the Romans.

Let me give one illustration—though it would be easy to produce many—of this

serious shortcoming. On p. 60 we read: 'Servius says that the ancient custom was to bury the dead in the house. Until the XII. Tables, the Romans were at any rate buried in the courtyard of the house, and down to late times, children who died before the fortieth day were laid in a niche in the wall, covered by a projecting roof or eaves.' Where did Mr. Granger find evidence for the first of these astonishing statements? He gives no reference, and of course the fragment of the Tables which he has in his mind simply says that dead persons were not to be buried or burnt within the city. The evidence of Roman and Italian archaeology is overwhelming on this question: if there is one thing of which we may be certain, it is that even in the most remote periods the dead were deposited in cemeteries outside the cities. Recent excavations have proved that the most primitive hill-communities in the near neighbourhood of Rome, which probably had come to an end even before the traditional date of Rome's foundation, had already given up the savage custom of burial in or close to the house. If Mr. Granger had not at hand the last volume of the *Monumenti Antichi*, he might at least have satisfied himself on this point by referring to Marquardt's excellent account of Roman burial customs. But this is not all. For the second of his statements, about the burial of babes under forty days old, he refers us to Lewis and Short's *Lexicon s.v. suggrundarium*. There is but one citation to be found there, and that one is from Fulgentius, a writer of the sixth century A.D., famous for his habit of inventing quotations where he could not find them to his hand. And even Fulgentius does not say what Mr. Granger does—that the children were deposited in niches in the

house-wall—nor as yet can I find any other evidence for the assertion.

From statements such as this I am forced to draw the conclusion that Mr. Granger is not to be trusted as an authority on Roman antiquities. I must add, that whenever he touches on a really difficult subject, such as the Lupercalia, or Hercules, or the Indigitamenta, his want of a better equipment produces a feeling of discomfort in the mind of a reader who has once become acquainted with the difficulties they present. Mr. Granger writes with a light heart of them, and has suggestions and parallels to draw in each case: but these seldom carry weight, for they are not the result of a thorough and independent examination, such as we find in Robertson Smith's admirable *Religion of the Semites*.

Still, when all is said, the book is clever, interesting, and sometimes suggestive. If the student of Roman antiquity will carefully test it at all doubtful points, and take nothing in it for granted, he may incidentally learn a great deal. And if its writer will devote a few years to a patient study of Roman religious ideas and practice, his wide reading in folklore and mythology, and his obvious brightness of mind and interest in his subject will no doubt enable him to produce something which shall be really worthy to survive. New facts and new theories are now constantly contributing to throw light upon the religious life of the Greeks and Romans: folklore and archaeology are alike helping us forward. But the first and most essential step for any one who would contribute to the process, is to make himself thoroughly acquainted with all that Greeks or Romans have themselves to tell us.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.

By the late DEAN BURGON and the Rev. E. MILLER. Published by George Bell and Sons. 10s. 6d. net.

In this volume Mr. Miller has used his own and Dean Burgon's researches to support the view that the traditional text of the New Testament is the oldest and best.

It must be recognized that the logical

basis of the book is a belief that a true statement of the doctrine of inspiration would support the traditional text to the exclusion of all others, but this fact is not obtruded; and even those who do not agree with the authors either in their doctrinal or critical position, are bound to admit that a sincere attempt is made to answer critical questions by critical methods.

The authors point out that the oldest

evidence which we possess for the text is not the direct evidence of the MSS. but the indirect evidence of Patristic quotations. They therefore begin with an examination of the text of the early Fathers and endeavour to show that it supports the traditional view. We are given a full analysis of the Pre-Chrysostomic writers and the results which Mr. Miller has reached. But as considerations of space prevented the quotations being given in full, we are reduced for purposes of criticism to thirty passages which Mr. Miller has selected as representative and given with a full statement of the Patristic evidence on either side in each case. But the followers of Drs. Westcott and Hort fail to be convinced by this part of the book, because the selected passages are with few exceptions representative of the traditional text only in so far as that text embodies a western element, and all critics are prepared to admit that the western text was habitually used by a majority of the Pre-Chrysostomic Fathers. There are probably not more than three passages in Mr. Miller's list which are 'distinctively Syrian' and it is noticeable that in these cases the Patristic evidence is markedly weak. For instance, in Mt. xxviii. 2 the traditional text as supported by the mass of late MSS. against *NBD* latt Origen reads *ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας* after *ἀπεκάλυσεν τὸν λίθον*, but all the Patristic evidence which Mr. Miller can adduce in favour of this addition is that of Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa, with the support of the Gospel of Nicodemus, Acta Philippi, Apocryphal Acta Apostolorum, and perhaps Acta Pilati and the gospel of St. Peter.

Surely this is insufficient to set aside the probability that the later MSS. owe their reading to harmonizing with the parallel passage in St. Mark?

It is also noticeable that Mr. Miller seems to have taken a wide view of the extent of the field in which it is possible to find Patristic evidence for the text of the canonical gospels, and is also somewhat prone to set down passages as quotations from one source which might be referred equally well to another. For instance, it is doubtful, at least, whether it is legitimate to quote the gospel of St. Peter and the other extracanonical writings mentioned above as evidence for the text of St. Matthew, although we may recognize the testimony so far as it concerns the historicity of the events narrated.

And it is scarcely wise to quote as authorities for one canonical gospel rather

than another, or perhaps for any canonical gospel at all, books like the *Διδαχὴ* of which it is impossible at present to say with certainty from what source they are quoting.

It is also probably true that Mr. Miller has occasionally allowed himself to forget that the text of his authorities themselves is often corrupt. For he quotes the epistle of St. Barnabas in support of the addition *εἰς μετὰ τοὺς* in Mt. ix. 13 though this is not found in either Lightfoot's or Gebhardt and Harnack's editions of St. Barnabas, but only in Migne and other unrevised texts. This is perhaps due to the fact that textual criticisms of the New Testament and of the Fathers are so closely connected that the view taken of one must influence the opinion formed of the other. Similarly the other tendencies noted in Mr. Miller's treatment of Patristic evidence are probably due to an ultraconservative position with regard to the synoptic and kindred questions. Although the higher criticism of documents postulates a fairly correct text, yet inasmuch as the higher criticism is logically anterior to textual criticism, it necessarily follows that the results of the two react on each other. Mr. Miller reduces written documents preceding the canonical gospels, if one may judge from the remarks he has let fall in this book, to the smallest possible number and significance. Most other critics are inclined to believe that the first and second century church possessed documents not now extant which perhaps formed the basis of the canonical gospels. The result is that they are inclined to class some of the curious phenomena of the earliest Patristic quotations as bearing on the problems of higher criticism, while Mr. Miller presses them into the service of the textualist.

In view of these facts we cannot accept Mr. Miller's statement that judging from Patristic evidence the traditional text was predominant in Pre-Chrysostomic times, and it is somewhat strange to read 'Let any one who disputes this conclusion make out for the western text... a case which can equal that which has now been placed before the reader' seeing that it is the western text and no other which Mr. Miller's evidence supports.

After dealing with the evidence of the Fathers Mr. Miller proceeds to discuss the Syriac and Latin versions. It is perhaps unnecessary to say more of his treatment of the former than that he still maintains the position which is taken up in his edition of Scrivener's Introduction. That is, he considers the Peshitto to be the oldest

version in Syriac and regards the Curetonian and Sinaitic as corruptions of it. Such a view can be dealt with at first hand only by Syriac scholars, but the evidence of experts seems to be against Mr. Miller.

The treatment of the Latin versions is more important. Mr. Miller sets forth a most interesting analysis of the testimony of the various codices, both as regards readings and renderings, in order to show that there are many Latin versions and not one only. There is considerable weight in his argument: multiplicity of rendering *prima facie* suggests multiplicity of versions, but on the other hand he has perhaps not allowed sufficiently for the effect of mixture and for the probability that scribes who knew Greek would be apt to emend the rendering of difficult places. Possibly Mr. Miller has not done more than emphasize the distinction between the African and European Latin, using the words in a textual and not necessarily geographical sense.

Mr. Miller goes on to elaborate a theory:—The 'Itala' of Augustine was the oldest and best version, the other versions were those used in the less cultured and critical parts of the empire, and judging the Itala from St. Augustine's use of it, it supported the traditional text rather than the Neologian. The last part of the argument is indisputable, but a flood of light has been thrown on the first clauses by Mr. Burkitt's monograph on 'The Itala and old Latin' which shows reason for believing that the 'Itala' of Augustine is the Vulgate. Nothing could be more damaging to Mr. Miller's position. His argument in reply to those who say that the traditional text is a recension has always been that there is no proof of it. Yet in the present case we find him selecting the Itala as the oldest Latin version and pointing to it as supporting the traditional text, whereas, if Mr. Burkitt be right, the Itala is after all a recension, the date and authorship of which is well known. This is of course not demonstrative proof against Mr. Miller's position, but it is certainly damaging.

Mr. Miller sets forth a complete theory of the history of the text in opposition to the well known one of Westcott and Hort, which must be noticed. He admits a certain type of Alexandrian corruption and another of Syrio-Low-Latin and considers that these together with the traditional text were worked over by Origen and his school at

Caesarea, with the result that they produced the type of text preserved in **NB**.

Mr. Miller supports this theory by an attempt to show, (1) that **NB** are connected with the Library at Caesarea, (2) that a sceptical spirit can be traced in **NB**. As to (1). It is scarcely proved that **NB** come from Caesarea, but reason is certainly shown for believing that Origen and Pamphilus used MSS. of a similar character. This is deducible from the colophon in **N** at the end of the book of Esther to the effect that the MS. was compared with a copy corrected by Pamphilus and found similar to it. But it must be remembered that this only shows that Pamphilus and Origen used MSS. of this type not that they manufactured them, and that it is universally acknowledged that **N** has a composite text, consisting of Western and Alexandrian as well as 'Neutral' elements. So then, all that follows from Mr. Miller's argument is that if we grant its conclusiveness we have in the critical school of Caesarea an historic cause for the compositeness of the text of **N**. It still remains for him to show that the non-Western, non-Alexandrian, non-Neutral part of the traditional text was one of the elements thus compounded.

(2) Mr. Miller's second point cannot be received favourably. It introduces some of the most difficult points of dogma into a purely critical question, and to say that 'omission is in itself sceptical,' which is the logical basis of this section, is as much a begging of the question as it would be to say that doctrinal additions are signs of little faith in the sufficiency of Scripture.

Mr. Miller promises us another volume dealing with 'causes of corruption.' This is sure to be an interesting book, but is it vain to hope that Mr. Miller will some-day publish the exact text which he considers 'Traditional'? At present clear criticism is difficult because we do not know accurately what is the text which Mr. Miller supports. Judging from some of the samples, one is almost inclined to think that the 'Traditional' text may prove to be a modified Western text, and this of course would raise the difficult question of why the Western text is to be regarded as a corruption, seeing that it can be traced back in the earliest quotations which we possess.

K. LAKE.

VAN CLEEF'S INDEX TO ANTIPHON.

Index Antiphonticus, composuit FRANK LOUIS VAN CLEEF, PH.D. Published for Cornell University. Boston, U.S.A., 1895. Pp. vi. + 173.

THIS excellent volume is No. V. of the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. It is not, in the strict sense, a lexicon, for, except in rare cases, it contains no definitions. To take the place of these, each word is cited with its context, as in Dobson's edition of the *Oratores Attici* (London, 1828, I. pp. 151-178), so that the syntactic relation of every word is shown at a glance. The omission of unimportant words in the context is indicated by asterisks, or, when more than five consecutive words are omitted, by lines. The citations are given with unusual care, but it may be pointed out that ἀνακτεῖν in iv. β 1 (*vid. s. h. v.*) does not depend on ἤθελον, as one might at first sight suppose from Dr. Van Cleef's citation, but on δοκῶ, and further, it represents a potential optative, so that ἄν should have been quoted with it. It is correctly given under ἄν, at page 10. Again, it is not quite accurate to enter ἄν πράξειν under ἄν iii. B (p. 10), where cases of ἄν with the infinitive representing an optative are recorded.

The forms of words and the parts of verbs are entered in their order as usually observed in grammars and dictionaries, but we note that ἀπείρημαι and προείρημαι form lemmas by themselves, and are not referred to under ἀπαγορεύω and προαγορεύω, although ἀπῆλθεν, εἰσῆλθεν, and ὑπῆλθεν are found under ἀπέρχομαι, εἰσέρχομαι, and ὑπέρχομαι respectively, forms which do not occur. There is also some inconsistency in making a lemma of δίδμνυμαι, not δίδμνυμι (which does not occur), whereas τέθηκα is entered under θνήσκω, a form which is of course always replaced by ἀποθνήσκω.

A few definitions are given wherever it is necessary to distinguish different senses in which a word is used, as, for example, under ἀνὴρ, βουλεύω, εἰκός, μῆν. At the end of each article a figure in parenthesis indicates the number of times the word in question occurs in Antiphon. A few corrections of these

figures are found in the *Addenda*, which is creditably small. Another great convenience in the study of the orator's vocabulary is the statement, under each simple verb, of the compound forms in which it occurs.

The compiler has adhered so closely to the text of Blass's second edition (Teubner, 1881), that MS. variants and editorial conjectures have perhaps not been recorded as completely and consistently as one might wish. In the case of ἥδρον, μεσεγγνάω, οἰκτίρω, Μυτιληναῖος, we have, to be sure, notices of the MSS. spelling εὔδρον, μεσεγγνάω, οἰκτείρω, Μυτιλήνη, etc., but under μυνήσκω and ἀναμυνήσκω, Ἡρώδης, and σφάζω, no notice of the fact that the codices consistently omit iota subscript. Under σφάπτω, Jernstedt's contention that σφάζω is the only possible form in the first five orations is disregarded. There should also be noticed, under Ἀμυνίας, Jernstedt's proposal of Ἀμεινίας; and under Διπόλεια, Scheibe's emendation, of ἐν Διπολείois for ἐν τῇ πόλει (vi. 39), based on Harpocration.

Some misprints must inevitably occur in a work involving such labour. A few are here noted: for Ἀμπέλινος (lemma), read Ἀμπελίνος; s. βιάζομαι, for βιαζόμενος read βιαζόμενος; for ἀναβοέω (lemma), read ἀναβοάω; s. ἀποκρίνομαι, for ἀποκριμένου read ἀποκριομένου; for εἰκάζω (lemma), read εἰκάξω; s. ἐρωτάω, for ἐρωτώντων read ἐρωτώντων; s. ἰδοῦ, read ἰδοῦ (*bis*); s. κόσμος, for ἐπέλιτε, read ἐπέλιπε; s. ἀλιτήριος (*sic*), read ἀλιτήριος throughout the article; s. ὁμορόφιος, read ὁμορόφις (*bis*); s. σχετλιάζω, correct σκετλιάζει. A few other errors in accents and breathings occur.

Praise is due to the work for its thoroughness, clearness, and neatness of arrangement. The author purposes to issue similar indices which, in the case of the orators especially, will doubtless be of great service. There are good indices to the complete orators in Baiter and Sauppe's and in C. Müller's editions, but these contain chiefly only the proper names, of which there are hardly above fifty in Antiphon. No index we know of is as complete and serviceable as the present one.

CHARLES BURTON GULICK.

RIBBECK'S VIRGIL.

P. Vergili Maronis opera apparatu critico in artius contracto iterum recensuit OTTO RIBBECK. (Teubner.) 1894—1895. 8vo. Pp. 941. M. 22 40.

THE first edition of Ribbeck's *Virgil* was published between the years 1854 and 1860, at a momentous period in the history of Latin scholarship. Ritschl's *Plautus* and Lachmann's *Lucretius* preceded it by a little, Mommsen's *History of Rome* was its contemporary, Madvig's *Livy* followed soon after, his *De Finibus* had appeared a little before it. It was an age of new things in learning as in politics and the revolutions of February and March were not more sweeping than the changes wrought by these scholars. To Ribbeck, in particular, we owe an entirely new, an infinitely more accurate presentation of Virgil's poems. There were *fortes ante Agamemnona*, Heinsius, Heyne, Wagner, and others, but the text of Virgil before 1854 was in a condition which now perhaps is hardly appreciated. Traces of it may be detected in the first volume of Conington's commentary, issued in 1858 and compiled to some extent under the influence of the older views—*e.g.* that MSS. should be counted, not classified—but most of our modern editions are based upon Ribbeck's work and seldom even allude to the unliterary and sometimes even illiterate copies of Virgil which passed muster before 1850. Ribbeck unfortunately was not content with his own work. When he had laid the foundations for the textual criticism of Virgil and had made it possible for the world to read and enjoy something

like the real Virgil, he went on to spoil the result by theories and conjectures which seriously detracted from the worth of his text, and at the present day his name is connected by most people with a number of bad emendations rather than with a gigantic improvement in the text of Virgil. Such then was Ribbeck's first great edition: now it has done a large part of its work and has indeed been long out of print. The new edition is suited to the new state of things. The first edition, with its copious critical commentary and its elaborate Prolegomena, was suited to inaugurate the new era: the book before me has no Prolegomena nor even a list of manuscripts, and its critical commentary has been pruned of everything not absolutely necessary to fix the text of the poet. What is given, is of course brought up to date. The Medicean codex is quoted from the collation of Hoffmann: such new readings or 'testimonia' as have been discovered since 1860 and are worth quoting are quoted, and many similar improvements have been made. The text is also altered, I think, for the better. Many doubtful conjectures have disappeared, though there still remain many to which a conservative and cautious critic must object. The doctrines of strophes in the Eclogues and of transpositions in the poems generally are also still adhered to, but the latter is applied more sparingly. The total result is a very valuable book, a text which is certainly improved, and a critical commentary which is full, concise, and accurate, and which is also improved.

F. HAVERFIELD.

THE BATTLES OF THE TREBIA AND LAKE TRASIMENE.—A REPLY TO MR. GRUNDY.

MR. GRUNDY, whose careful study of several of the principal Greek and Roman battle-fields lends weight to his criticism, has attacked the view we have taken of these two battles, and especially of the battle on the Trebia. It is not our intention to offer a detailed defence. The question has been too often thrashed out already. But Mr. Grundy has charged us with displaying a fine independence and assuming a disrespectful attitude to the

ancient authorities. We are accused of an unjustifiable assault on two respectable historians, and the sin apparently is not only flagrant, but original. Yet if we sin we sin in good company.

With regard to the Trebia, Professor Mommsen in his latest and definitive edition (*English Trans.* vol. ii. p. 272 note) considers the view assailed by Mr. Grundy, 'indisputable' and declares that 'the erroneousness of the view of Livy,' which Mr. Grundy

follows, 'has lately been repeatedly pointed out.' Dr. Neumann in his full and competent history of the Punic wars, deliberately rejects the view supported by Mr. Grundy though in some respects modifying the account given by Mommsen. Mr. W. T. Arnold, who would naturally maintain his grandfather's version, can only quote Ihne in support, and admits that Mommsen's is the 'current view.' He shows that there are difficulties in either theory, and that phrases like Mommsen's 'indisputable' (or Mr. Grundy's 'quite clear') are out of place. As he justly says, 'Polybius omits the essential point' and 'we are left to study the map and to weigh all the circumstances before we can come to a *probable* conclusion.' What need to pile up more names?

The reader of Mr. Grundy's article would scarcely believe that we have nowhere expressed a *decided opinion*. No doubt there can be found an implied preference for the current view, as agreeing better with our conception of the strategy of the whole campaign, but after a careful study at first hand both of the ancient authorities and of the best modern criticisms, we determined to record the two versions without concealing the difficulties of either alternative (cf. p. 185).

We still hold that, in view of the careless topography of the ancients, and of the inevitable inaccuracy of all, even the most recent, military history, such problems must remain insoluble. But we are obliged to Mr. Grundy for a useful correction. He has pointed out an error in the description of Scipio's second position due to the loose use of a military term.

With regard to the Trasimene we are too

much in agreement to dispute about details: in the one point at issue we again follow excellent authority, nor are we at all sure that Mr. Grundy's innovation is made convincing by his arguments. The questions raised by our critic can of course be adequately dealt with only by a trained scholar who is also an experienced soldier. Mr. Grundy by his local investigations has done good service to Roman history. His valuable study on the topography of the Trebia (*Journal of Philology*, vol. 24) may possibly turn the balance of probability, in a case where certainty is not attainable. Of his criticism we have only this complaint to make: he has, we think, exaggerated the extent of our departure from the ancient authorities, whose unanimity he has unduly emphasised, and apparently he has not fully considered those contradictions and deficiencies in the sources of ancient history which have led modern critics to reconstructions compared with which Mommsen's treatment of the Trebia is conservative. Thus he makes our agreement about this battle with the ablest modern historians a ground for charging us substantially with an attitude of wilful innovation, and an unsound critical method. For this the only proof given is our treatment of two minor points of military detail, disputable in themselves, and still a matter of controversy between experts.

In conclusion we have to thank Mr. Grundy heartily for his generous praise of our work as a whole, and our treatment of the remainder of the Hannibalic war in particular.

W. W. HOW.

H. D. LEIGH.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DITTENBERGER AND PURGOLD'S OLYMPIA.

Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung. Textband V.: Die Inschriften, bearbeitet von W. DITTENBERGER and K. PURGOLD. Berlin 1896. 50 M.

THE monumental record of the excavations undertaken by the German Government at Olympia is gradually approaching completion. The present year has also seen the

publication of the second volume, containing an account of the architectural remains; and now all that remains to be published is vol. i., containing a general history of Olympia and the fate of the monuments, and a detailed account of the excavations, and vol. iii., part 2, completing the description of the sculpture and terra-cottas.

A work of this kind seems to be almost beyond criticism, in view of the fact that no expense is spared in its production and that the services of the most eminent scholars in each branch of the subject have been en-

listed, and it is no exaggeration to say that in the volume under consideration the high standard of Professor Treu's work on the sculpture, of Professor Furtwängler's on the bronzes, and of Dr. Dörpfeld and his coadjutors on the architecture, has been fully maintained. In some respects this must necessarily be the least attractive volume of the series, and it is of course essentially a book for the scholar rather than the ordinary reader; but at the same time no series of inscriptions from any Greek site can have a wider or more varied interest, both historical and artistic, than those of Olympia. For among them are to be found not only documents of great historical interest, but many signatures of artists known and unknown, and many which either refer to works of art still existing or excavated on the site, or help to throw light on the statements of Pausanias and other classical writers. And we must not lose sight of the fact that in many cases palaeographical evidence of great value is to be obtained from them, the number of archaic inscriptions in various dialects found at Olympia having been remarkably large.

This volume contains about 950 inscriptions, including not only those found during the actual progress of the excavations, but many that had been found by travellers in past years or had otherwise come accidentally to light, such as the two bronze dedicatory helmets in the British Museum or the bronze tablet with the treaty between the Eleaens and the Heraeans, all of which have been for many years in that institution.

Nos. 1-57 include all the documents of a political nature, 1-43 those inscribed on bronze tablets, 44-57 those on stone; 58-141 give lists of religious officials, and 142-243 inscriptions relating to victors in the games. Next come the dedicatory inscriptions, 244-292, and these are followed by a long list of inscriptions on honorary monuments, 293-609; most of these date from Roman times. The next section contains the inscriptions from the exedra of Herodes Atticus; these are followed by one of the most interesting sections of all, the artists' signatures (629-648). The remainder is occupied with architectural inscriptions (649-691), explanatory inscriptions (692-810), i.e. such as have reference to the nature of the object inscribed or the purpose to which it was put, as for instance the stone thrown by Bybon (No. 717); and finally we have two sepulchral inscriptions, 811, 812, and a series of fragments of doubtful signification, 813-912. To this list of Greek

inscriptions is added a small number in Latin, 913-929, and the total of 950 is made up by 31 additional inscriptions included in a 'Nachtrag.' Yet another 'Nachtrag' deals with a series of Greek weights classified in groups.

Among all these inscriptions there are probably very few that are now published for the first time, for not only were the greater number published in the *Archäologische Zeitung* during the course of the excavations, but many had either been previously discovered and published, or have had attention called to them since the excavations owing to their palaeographical or historical importance. At the same time we do not wish to imply that these facts in any way lessen the value of the work under consideration; we are rather the more grateful that the results of all previous work on these inscriptions are now rendered easily accessible by the labours of Messrs. Dittenberger and Purgold. The advantage of this is obvious when we see to what extent the bibliography of such inscriptions as Nos. 9, 249, 250, 252, 259, has reached. And in addition we have in not a few cases further light thrown on their interpretation or new and important readings suggested. To take one instance, the reading of the British Museum bronze tablet (No. 9) may now be regarded as finally settled, and the most satisfactory interpretation adopted; hitherto the opinion on most of the doubtful points had been fairly divided.

Another case in which a reading appears to have been finally adopted is the Bybon inscription (No. 717), although the rendering *ὑπερεβάλετο ὁ Φόλα* appears to us to be still open to criticism. The name Pholas is not otherwise known, but that of course is not in itself an insuperable objection. It is certainly a more satisfactory reading than the old *τὸ οὐφόρα* (= ὁ ἐφόρα) which seems to us clumsy and forced. We are rather disposed to suggest *τὸ ὁ 'φόρει*, 'that which he carried,' which appears to be admitted by the traces of the letters on the stone, but the facsimile does not allow of obtaining absolute certainty on this point. The new reading *ὑπερκεφάλᾳ μ' ὑπερεβ.* is certainly ingenious, if somewhat bold. The authors are strongly in favour of the Elean origin of this inscription.

Many ingenious restorations of names have been made by the help of Pausanias, as for instance No. 267, where the remaining letters of the dedicator's name...*νιος Φοικίων* ἐν Τεγέῃ, suggested a reference to Paus. v. 26: *τὸν γὰρ δὴ Μίκυθον...οἶχοντο ἐς Τεγέαν...*

καὶ Ἑλλήνιδας αὐτῷ πόλεις Ῥήγιόν τε καὶ Μεσσήνην δίδωσιν· οἰκεῖν δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ γράμματα ἐν Τεγέᾳ φησὶν αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.; and the name can now be with certainty restored Μίκυθος ὁ Χοῖρου Ρηγῖνος καὶ Μεσσήνιος, κ.τ.λ. Instances might no doubt be multiplied.

Among the inscriptions of special historical interest to which we may call attention are: No. 47, p. 94, a considerable part of which is now published for the first time. It contains a decision of the people of Megalopolis and Sparta about some territory on the upper Eurotas, which, originally Arcadian, had been held by the Spartans for a long time, till Philip the son of Amyntas recovered it in the fourth century B.C. No. 52, p. 103, entitled Κρίσις περὶ χώρας Μεσσηνίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων, is of similar purport, but here the Milesians are the arbitrators. Here again is a question of land taken from the Spartans by Philip and restored to Messene. The circumstances are recorded by Tacitus (*Ann.* iv. 43). No. 54, p. 111, gives a decree of the Eleans in favour of honouring the pancratiast Ti. Claudius Rufus of Smyrna. The date is about A. D. 120. It is a noticeable fact that though an athlete of considerable reputation he had not in this particular instance gained a victory.

More interesting however and more palaeographically important are the inscriptions relating to victors in the games. No. 153 is a well-known instance, referring to an athlete whose name is lost, but who must have been very successful, as he won three times at Olympia in the pankration, three times at Delphi, seven at the Isthmus, and seven at Nemea in boxing. It was naturally supposed that Pausanias would have made reference to so distinguished an athlete, and he does in fact mention two who answer to this description. Treu referred it to Theagenes of Thasos (*Paus.* vi., 11, 2), but Foucart has shown that there are insuperable objections to him, not the least that the alphabet of the inscription is not Thasian, and points with greater probability to Dorieus of Rhodes (*Paus.* vi. 7, 4). The dates of his Olympian victories were B.C. 432, 428, 424. In the discussion of the Euthymos inscription (No. 144) we regret to see no notice taken of Dr. Waldstein's interesting papers in the *Hellenic Journal* (i. p. 168; ii. p. 332), in which he ingeniously traces a connection between the Choiseul-Gouffier 'Apollo' (or pugilist) in the British Museum and this statue of the boxer Euthymos by Pythagoras of Rhegion.

In No. 250, the bronze helmet dedicated

by the Argives in the British Museum, the third letter is certainly not Φ, but the curve of the D has been continued beyond the vertical stroke so as nearly to form a complete circle; to represent this by a Φ is misleading, though it is true that the inscription is not meant to be given in facsimile. But the Δ of Διφί and the P of Κορινθίον are correctly reproduced.

No. 259 is one of the most important and interesting inscriptions found at Olympia. As is well known, it is on the triangular base which once supported the Nike of Paionios, and now remains *in situ* near the temple of Zeus. The much disputed words ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων are discussed at great length by the authors, who give an unhesitating opinion that they refer to a general offering for victories over all their enemies, not only of the Messenians who had settled in Naupaktos (*Μεσσηνίων οἱ Ναύπακτόν ποτε λαβόντες*, *Paus.* v. 26, 1) but of the two peoples in common, *Μεσσηνίοι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι*. It is clear then that the words refer to no special victory. According to this view, which was first advanced by Schubart, the Nike was erected just after the Peace of Nikias. The authors are certainly right in referring τὰ κρωτήρια in the second inscription to the architectural ornaments on the top of the pediment, and not to the pedimental sculptures. They prefer however to leave it an open question whether Pausanias misunderstood the inscription, or was right in attributing to Paionios the sculptures of the East pediment. The well-known Praxiteles inscription (266) has been somewhat unfortunately separated from the two others (630 and 631) which have been proved by Prof. Furtwängler to belong to it; it would have been much better for purposes of reference to have kept them together, though it would of course have violated the system of classification observed by the authors (*v. supra*).

The volume is on the whole beautifully printed and the fac-similes both good and useful, but we may perhaps be permitted to enter a protest against the long s's, the use of which is much to be deprecated as imparting an unnecessary appearance of archaism to the book, besides the worrying effect that it has on the reader. Another point to which reference must be made is that the manner in which the condition of the stone is reproduced by shading in many of the fac-similes, gives them an almost grotesque appearance; some indeed might be taken for magnified portions of the moon's surface or plans of glaciers in an

Alpine hand-book (see especially No. 147-148), while No. 637 suggests more than anything else a procession of letters traversing an arctic ice-floe!

But it is ungrateful to carp at slight defects of this kind, and they may well be ignored in view of the sound scholarship and careful workmanship which have made this volume by no means the least valuable of the great series of publications on Olympia. We beg to offer our heartiest congratulations to the authors and to the German Government, for bringing the great work in so worthy a manner one step nearer its completion.

H. B. WALTERS.

GARDNER'S *HANDBOOK OF GREEK SCULPTURE*.

A Handbook of Greek Sculpture. By E. A. GARDNER. Part I. 5s.

THE chief difficulty of writing a small handbook of the history of Greek sculpture is of course that of selecting from the ever-growing mass of material monuments and too often immaterial theories. It may be said at the outset that Prof. Ernest Gardner, in the first volume of his new manual, has come very near to perfection in this matter. The little book, which covers practically the same period as Collignon's first volume, contains a surprising amount of information, presented with lucidity and in the good English which has up till now been conspicuously absent in books of the sort. Of that information there is but little that can be dispensed with by those who wish for a good outline of the development of sculpture up to the time of Pheidias. An author's temptation to give his pet theories or subjects an unduly prominent place must be great; but, while those acquainted with Mr. Gardner's previous writings will occasionally recognise an old friend, they will find him as a rule relegated to a modest position. The technical processes of sculpture in marble rightly occupy a prominent position in the introduction; but the author's theories as to the relation of Pheidias to Hegias, and as to the statement of Pliny that Myron was *numerosior in arte quam Polyclitus et in symmetria diligentior*, which were stated in the *Classical Review* for 1894 (pp. 69, 70), appear in small type. The only instance in which he can with any ground be accused of erring in this respect

is his description of the paintings of Panaenus at Olympia, which might conceivably have been omitted in a work on sculpture where space is limited. The selection of illustrations is on the whole extremely judicious. An elementary handbook should of course contain illustrations of all the most important monuments, whether otherwise easily accessible or not. Each reader will wish, according to his taste, that this or that had been included; but there will surely be few who will not miss the lions from the gate at Mycenae, the Heracles from the Aegina pediment, the Tübingen hoplitodromos, the relief of the athlete carrying a discus, and the head and shoulders of Athena from the early Athenian pediment. One of these might have replaced the statue from Eleutherna; but to tell the truth there is hardly anything else that one would wish to forego. A word should be said in praise of the execution of the illustrations, which, though they are ordinary process-blocks, are as a rule eminently satisfactory. To this rule the few coins and gems illustrated form an almost inevitable exception.

So much for the method. To come to the matter of the book, all praise must be given to the introduction, especially as far as it relates to the technique of sculpture. There is no similar treatment of this subject in any other English work. The question of the colouring of marble statues is excellently treated. That in the case of the nude parts the colouring was driven into the stone by heat, so as not to form an opaque coat and obscure the transparency of the stone, is certain. But if so driven in, one would expect it to be more permanent than when merely laid on the surface. Mr. Gardner does not mention the fact that it is rarer to find colouring on these nude parts than on the hair, dress, &c. The tints used for flesh were of course subtler, and therefore more liable to disappear; but the chief reason is that the nude parts were more highly polished, and the rougher surfaces retained the colour more easily. This high polish also explains the good preservation of the nude as compared with the other surfaces. As the former were not covered with a coat of paint, the colouring can hardly have acted as a protection, although their better preservation has by some been attributed to such a cause.

Space forbids more than the mere mention of a few of the points which suggest themselves in the body of the work. In

connection with his remarks on p. 55, Mr. Gardner will be glad to know that a heraldic scheme of two lions with a column between them, closely resembling the scheme of the Mycenae gate, occurs on an electrum stater, almost certainly of Lydian origin and of the seventh century B.C. The coin is now in the National Collection. The statement (p. 98) that Dipoenus and Scyllis made a life-size statue of *emerald*—surely a precious work!—should be revised. The *λίθος σμάραγδος* in question must be some kind of green stone—other than emerald. On p. 111 the combination of profile with front- (or rather under-) face treatment in the so-called 'Harpies' of the Xanthian tomb should have been noticed, as a similar combination is noticed in the case of the Selinus metopes. It is hardly fanciful to suppose with Collignon that the curious spreading of the dress at the feet of the statue dedicated by Cheramyas to Hera (p. 113) is a reminiscence of the spreading of the roots of a tree. This is a small enough point, but would, if noted, have served to fix in the student's memory the origin of such cylindrical forms from tree-worship. The discussion of the Aegina pediments is excellent; but the effect on the character of the figures of the fact that the Aeginetans were mainly workers in bronze is not sufficiently emphasized. The Tübingen hoplitodromos is not mentioned among the works of the Aeginetan school; but, as already indicated, it is surely important enough to demand illustration. The explanation of the column under the right hand of the Athena Parthenos as represented in the Varvakeion statuette (p. 256), viz. that it is not original, but was placed there as a result of a break-down in the internal balance of weight, is plausible; but still so early a reproduction as that on the fourth-century coin of Nagidus (Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, Pl. Y xxii) shows a tree supporting the hand. The suggested break-down must therefore have occurred very early, since in a relief there was no necessity to introduce such a support.

The second volume will bring the history down to the period of Graeco-Roman sculpture. If it is as sound in method and as well written as the first, the manual will easily supersede all other elementary English books on the subject. Messrs. Macmillan could hardly have made a better start with their new series of Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities.

G. F. HILL.

KNOKE ON ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.

Die römischen Moorbrücken in Deutschland, von PROF. DR. F. KNOKE. (Berlin: Gärtner.) Pp. 136, 8vo. M. 5.
Das Varuslager im Habichtswalde, von PROF. DR. F. KNOKE. (Berlin: Gärtner.) Pp. 20, Imp. 8vo. M. 4.

MR. KNOKE, headmaster of a school at Osnabrück, is well-known as an enthusiastic student of the Roman antiquities of his neighbourhood. In his *Kriegszüge des Germanicus* he essayed the difficult task of tracing the routes followed by Germanicus in his two German campaigns as described by Tacitus in the *Annals*. The two pamphlets before me deal with similar but smaller problems. In the first, Dr. Knoke discusses the *pontes longi* crossed by Caecina (*Ann.* i. 63): he collects instances of ancient wooden causeways which have been discovered in the great mosses of north-western Germany and identifies the *pontes longi* with one of these causeways, which crossed the 'Great Moss' near Diepholz, a little north of Osnabrück and a little north also of Barenau, where Mommsen puts the scene of the defeat of Varus. In the second pamphlet, he argues that he has discovered the last camp of the Varian army in a wood between Osnabrück and Münster. I do not think that either conclusion can be accepted as proven. The north-west of Germany contains a great many ancient roads and its mosses have yielded many traces of *pontes longi*. Dr. Knoke's enumeration of these causeways is a valuable piece of local research and his illustrations are very interesting, but we have at present no reason for considering them to be Roman, nor does Dr. Knoke in reality advance any such reason: there is, in fact, nothing about them to indicate any special date or origin. The vague pictorial language of Tacitus certainly does not seem to me to prove that the causeways near Diepholz must lie on the line of Caecina's march. I have the same objections to bring against Dr. Knoke's location of the 'Varuslager.' He has found a large earthwork, one or two details of which bear a certain resemblance to Roman work; but no single Roman object has been found on the site, and the general shape of the earthwork is not in the least like that of an ordinary Roman encampment. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the case for the earthwork is not only not proven, but that the balance of evidence adduced by Dr. Knoke is

against it. The whole problem of the topography of the routes of Varus and Germanicus is one of singular difficulty, owing to the lack of trustworthy evidence. What is wanted at present is not theory, but the collection of facts. Here, as elsewhere, Mommsen has shown the way by basing his account of the defeat of Varus on actual finds of coins made at Barenau. In the preface to his paper on the problem, he appeals to local archaeologists to collect more facts and especially to pay attention to finds of coins. Unfortunately the local archaeologists have not to any great extent responded to the appeal. The evidence of ancient roads put together by Dr. Dünzelmann (*C.R.* vii. 424), Dr. Knoke and others, is a step in the right direction, but it must be followed by many other steps before definite results can be attained. The mere fact that an old road crosses a moss which the Romans *may* have crossed or that an earthwork (with no specially Roman characteristics) exists on a spot where the Romans *may* once have been encamped, does not prove that the road or the earthwork are inevitably Roman, and, to speak plainly, it ought not to be necessary to say this.

F. H.

GUIDE TO SPALATO AND SALONA.

Guida di Spalato e Salona, dai PROF. DR. L. JELIĆ, MONS. DIR. FR. BULIĆ, e PROF. S. RUTAR. Svo. pp. vii. and 280, with 4 Maps and 21 Illustrations. Zara, 1894. 7 M.

CROATIAN archaeologists labour under the disadvantage of having to appeal to the world at large in either German or Italian, preferably the latter. Consequently little is heard of their achievements except indirectly through such works as Mr. Jackson's *Dalmatia*. Even the first Congress of Christian Archaeologists held at Spalato in 1894 failed to attract attention, as it should have done. This guide published in Croatian and translated into Italian is the best account yet given of what is to be seen at Spalato and of what is known about the neighbourhood. There the visitor can see monuments of successive periods, from the foundation of the Greek colonies in the sixth century B.C. down to the end of the Middle Ages. The Palace of Diocletian is known to the world, but the unique Baptistery and the wonderful Christian cemetery and Basilica at Salona have not yet received their due.

NO. XCI. VOL. X.

These are all described with accurate brevity in the guide, and plans, up to date, are given which supersede anything hitherto published. An archaeological map of the neighbourhood shows the Greek, Roman and mediaeval sites round the Bay of Spalato. Illustrations of the chief buildings, some of which have already done duty in the volume on Dalmatia, in the late Crown Prince Rudolf's work, and phototypes of interesting objects are added.

The book is specially written for the use of archaeologists but contains a list of hotels, excursions, etc., which make it valuable even to the ordinary traveller.

It bears witness on every page to the indefatigable energy and enthusiasm of the editors, who have had to work with inadequate means and almost single-handed. It should be purchased by every archaeological society as an instance of what can be achieved by a few earnest men, who desire to make the past glories known to the world.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

GUIDE TO THE FORUM AT ROME.

Foro Romano (Escursioni Archéologiche in Roma, Parte 1), da ORAZIO MARUCCHI, with 1 Plan and 2 Illustrations. Svo. pp. 186. Rome, 1895.

SIGNOR MARUCCHI's lectures are well known to residents in Rome, and his present work is the beginning of a series of cheap handbooks based on them. Subsequent volumes will deal with the Palatine, the Catacombs and the Obelisks.

The volume on the Forum is a useful addition to the larger guide-books. It contains a useful account of the various theories of the topography and the slow steps by which the accepted identifications have been arrived at. Most of the authorities and many of the inscriptions are quoted at length, so that the book will be useful even to professed scholars.

Its shortcomings are to be found in the amazing inaccuracy of the Greek quotations, the frequency of repetitions and want of cross-references and finally the absence of an index.

It is well arranged for use on the spot and those who take it with them to the Forum will find that it will aid much in the understanding of points omitted by the guide-books. Such was our experience.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

F F

GUIDE TO THE COLLECTION OF
VASES AT MUNICH.

Führer durch die Vasen-sammlung König Ludwigs I. in der alten Pinakothek zu München, von A. FURTWÄNGLER. 12mo. pp. 52. Leipzig, 1896. 50 Pf.

PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER has begun his work at Munich by re-arranging the collection of vases. As all who have worked in the collection know, they were formerly arranged purely for decorative effect. Some stood on high pedestals, others on marble tables, fenced off by wire netting, with the

result that some were almost invisible and could only be seen when the porter had pushed a walking-stick through the grating and pulled them forwards. Now all is changed and the vases stand in their chronological order. The new guide gives a short sketch of the history of vase-painting and brief notices of the more important vases. It is intended for popular use, but will interest such students as are waiting for the detailed catalogue which the Professor has in hand. Jahn's old catalogue may still be used, as his numbers are given in the guide.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Hermathena. No. 22. 1896.

A Stele from Aswan in the British Museum, J. P. Mahaffy. The full text as far as it can be deciphered of this cippus found in 1886 and now in the Brit. Mus., given with explanations. The date is 115 A.C. *De Variis Formis Evangelii Lucani*, F. Blass. Continued from the previous vol. Maintains, as far as St. Luke is concerned, 'esse codicem D recensionis ejusdam peculiaris testem in multis satis sincerum, sinceriorem certe quam ullus est inter italae codices, in quibus saepe ejusdem recensionis lectiones inveniantur.' *Notes on Propertius*, J. B. Bury. A few critical notes. *The Epistle to Diognetus and its Possible Authorship*, J. Quarry. It is certain that Justin Martyr was not the author. Lightfoot conjectured Pantaenus. It is here suggested that it was Hippolytus, chiefly from a comparison with the *Philosophumena*. *Nugae Procopianae*, J. B. Bury. Some notes on Book i. of the Gothic War with reference to Comparetti's new edition. *Sophoclea*, R. Y. Tyrrell. Some critical notes on all the plays, among which we may mention *Tr.* 145 where Prof. Tyrrell would read *ῥάποις ἢ οὐ τήκει νιν οὐ θάλασος θεοῦ*, and in *Aj.* 869 rather boldly *κοῦτις ἐπιστάται μέτρα παρὰν τόπος* making a dochmiac of what is now a senarius. He also supports Hermann's conjecture *πέρυξ* 'a sacrificial knife,' for *πέρις* in *Antig.* 1301. *Marcus Brutus as Caesar's son*, L. C. Purser. Accounts thus for B. joining the conspiracy. 'Sympathy with republican sympathies where his own interest was not concerned, having these sympathies quickened by Porcia, stimulated by Cassius, and excited by various anonymous appeals that he should, like his ancestors, save his country, the stiff and ungracious student who was educated beyond his powers in all sorts of fantastic Greek notions about the virtue of tyrannicides, was driven into the position of nominal leader of the plot.' *Notes on Longinus περὶ ὑψους*, R. Ellis. *The Royalty of Pergamum*, J. P. Mahaffy. From inscriptions found at Pergamum we conclude that Eumenes was a 'powerful benefactor standing outside the Constitution. The title of king was not assumed by the dynasty till Attalus I. had conquered the Galatians, but Eumenes already has a yearly feast in his honour, and sacrifices are on that day made to him as to a

hero.' Also the genuineness of the Will of Attalus III. is established, but it was deliberately misconstrued by the Romans. He bequeathed to them only his private goods. The city itself could not be included among these. *Four notes on Lucilius*, A. Palmer, also a Note on *Suet. Claud.* 8, in which he proposes *succi* for *socci*, which last is scarcely intelligible.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Part 6. 1896.

Ueber den Zusammenhang der ältesten griechischen geschichtschreibung mit der epischen dichtung, J. M. Stahl. The connexion between historical writing and the Epic was severed in the writing of Thucydides. He should rather be called the father of history than Herodotus. *Nochmals Sophokles Electra* 1005-1008, J. Oeri. *Zur alexandrinischen literaturgeschichte*, F. Susenmühl. A criticism upon the view of Wilamowitz on the lives of Theocritus and Aratus. *Ursprung und anfang des Kleomenischen Krieges*, R. Schubert. This was brought on by the growth of the Achaean league which threatened Sparta, and by the efforts of Cleomenes to make himself sole master of the Peloponnese. Cleomenes led the way to the annihilation of the Spartan state. *Ueber lateinische von verwandtschaftsbeziehungen herrührende prae nomina*, A. Zimmermann. Examples are found in the names *Aulus*, *Opiter*, *Atta*, *Appius*, *Titus*, and *Annius*. *Zu Cicero De Legibus*, E. Hoffmann. *Zur handschriftlichen überlieferung der briefe Ciceros an Atticus*, L. Holzappel. Against O. E. Schmidt's view that these letters were originally separated into two equal parts. *Claudianae*, E. Arens. Some critical notes.

Part 7. *Zu Aischylos Agamemnon und Homeros*, Th. Plüss. An answer to Wilamowitz's criticism of the writer's edition of Enger's Agamemnon, *Zu Euripides Helene* 1171-1176, O. Hartlich. *Sokrates und Xenophon*, K. Lincke. We must examine the composition of the first book of the Memorabilia to see which of the two conceptions of the teaching and person of Socrates deserves the preference, or whether they are consistent with one another. *Theokritos und die bukolische poesie*, R. Helm. A common-sense reply to Reitzensteins's theory that

the bucolic poetry of Theocritus is nothing but religious mysticism. If this were so Th. must be struck out of the list of poets who are not concerned with riddles. *Zeus Báλνος*, O. Höfer. Identifies Zeus *Báλμος* of an inscr. from Bithynia with Dionysos *Báλμος*. *Nachlese zur frage nach den quellen Ciceros in ersten buch der Tusculanen*. L. Reinhard. The writer attributes §§ 19-22 and § 41 to Dicaearchus, §§ 39-52 (except § 41) to Posidonius, §§ 78-81, ? and the rest to Cicero himself. *Zu Catullus*, carm. 36,

H. Blümner. Directed against the new hypothesis that by *pessimus poeta* Catullus means himself and not Volusius. In l. 9 *pessima* agrees with *scripta* understood, not with *puella* [see Class. Rev. ix. 305]. *Zu Tibullus*. Continued from the last vol. An investigation of the pseudo-Tibullian panegyricus Messallae. *Das schlachtfeld im Teutoburger walde*, A. Wilms. Objections to the alleged discovery of the site by Stoltzenberg-Luttmersen.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Allcroft* (A. H.) The making of Athens: History of Greece, 495-431 B.C. Post 8vo. 222 pp. Clive. 4s. 6d.
Curtius (Quintus) Selections from the history of Alexander the Great, with notes and vocabulary by W. Humphreys. 16mo. Boston, Ginn. 55 cents.
Demosthenes, Select Private Orations, Part II., by J. E. Sandys and F. A. Paley, 3rd edition, revised. Cambridge University Press. 1s. 6d.
Dickinson (G. L.) The Greek view of life. Crown 8vo. 248 pp. Methuen. 2s. 6d.
Euripides. Alcestis, with introduction and notes by W. S. Hadley. 12mo. 184 pp. Pitt Press Series. 2s. 6d.
Hopkin (J. Clark) A study in Attic vase painting. 8vo. viii, 42 pp. 7 plates, 11 woodcuts. Leipzig. 6s.
Horatius. Liber epodon. Introduction and notes by J. S. Gow. 12mo. 450 pp. Pitt Press Series. 5s.
McCrindle (J. W. M.) Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, as described by Arrian, Q. Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch, and Justin. Translated with introduction, notes, maps, etc. New Edition. 8vo. 472 pp. Constable. 10s. 6d.

- Sophocles*. Plays and fragments. Notes, commentary, and translation in English prose by R. C. Jebb. Part VII.: The Ajax. 8vo. 332 pp. Camb. W. 12s. 6d.
Svete (H. B.) The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Second Edition. Vol. II. Crown 8vo. 891 pp. Cambridge Warehouse. 7s. 6d.
— The Psalms in Greek according to the Septuagint, with the Canticles. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d.
Thucydides. Brasidas in Thrace. From books 4 and 5. Ed. J. M. Sing. Crown 8vo. 86 pp. Rivingtons. 1s. 6d.
Wells (J.) A short history of Rome to the death of Augustus. Post 8vo. 366 pp., 4 maps. Methuen. 3s. 6d.
Wilby (St. W.) How to speak Latin; a series of Latin dialogues, with English translations. 24mo. iii, 204 pp. Baltimore, Murphy. 75 cents.
Williams (J.) Digest xviii-i, De contrahenda emptione, and xix-i, De actionibus empti venditi. Translated. Post 8vo. 56 pp. Simpkin. 1s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Altertümer von Pergamon-Herausgegeben im Auftrag des k. preuss. Ministers des Unterrichts. Angelegenheiten. Vol. IV. Die Theater-Terrasse. Von Rich. Bohn. Letterpress royal 4to. iv, 83 pp., engravings, and atlas in folio. 46 plates. Berlin, Spemann. 260 M.
Babuder (G.) L'eroicomico e generi affini di poesia giocoso-satirica. 8vo. 67 pp. Capodistria.
Bessolo (P.) De lyrico Romanorum carmine dissertatio. 12mo. 10 pp. Turin.
Bibliotheca philologica. 1895. General Index. 8vo. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and R. 1 M.
— 1896. Part I. 8vo. Same publishers. 1 M. 40.
Caetani-Loratelli (Gräfin Dr. Ersilia) Antike Denkmäler und Gebräuche. Aus dem Italienischen von Clara Schöner. 8vo. 108 pp. Leipzig, Freund. 2 M.
Callimachus. Vahlen (J.) Über einige Anspielungen in den Hymnen des Callimachus. Akad. 8vo. 31 pp. Berlin.
Cicero. Bergmüller (L.) Zur Latinität der Briefe des L. Munatius Plancus an Cicero. 8vo. x, 26 pp. Regensburg.

- Cicero*. Gassner (J.) M. T. Ciceronis librorum de natura deorum argumentum explicatur. 8vo. 8vo. 16 pp. Salzburg.
Comitorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Blaydes (F. H. M.) Adversaria in comitorum graecorum fragmenta. Part 2. 8vo. viii, 360 pp. Halle, Waisenhauss. 7 M.
Croiset (A.) et J. Petitjean. Grammaire grecque. 12mo. viii, 615 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr.
Dio Cassius. Micallella (M. A.) La fonte di Dione Cassio per le guerre galliche di Cesare: esame critico delle guerre contro gli Elvezi e contro Ariovisto. 8vo. 58 pp. Lecce.
Euripides. Hofinger (F.) Euripides und seine Sentenzen. I. 8vo 39 pp. Schweinfurt.
Furtwängler (Adf.) Beschreibung der geschnittenen Steine im Antiquarium der k. Museen zu Berlin. Royal 4to. xii, 391 pp., 129 engravings, 71 plates. Berlin, Spemann. 35 M.
— Intermezzi. Kunstgeschichtliche Studien. 4to. iii, 93 pp., 25 engravings, and 4 plates. Leipzig, Giesecke and D. 12mo.
— Über Statuencopieen im Alterthum. Part I.

- 4to. 64 pp., engravings and 12 plates. Munich, Franz. 8 M.
(Aus Abhandlungen der k. bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften.)
- Gerhard* (Ed.) Etruskische Spiegel. Vol. V. By A. Klugmann und G. Korte. Part 14. 4to. Pp. 173-180. 10 plates. Berlin, G. Reimer. 9 M.
- Grassi* (Dav.) Annibale giudicato da Polibio e Tito Livio. 8vo. 91 pp. Vicenza.
- Herkenrath* (R.) Studien zu den griechischen Grabchriften. 8vo. 56 pp. Feldkirch. 1 M. 50.
- Hesiodos, ins Deutsche übertragen, mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen von R. Peppmüller. 8vo. xi, 296 pp. 2 plates. Halle, Waisenhaus. 6 M.
- Homerus*. L' Iliade commentata da V. de Crescenzo. Libro I. 12mo. viii, 88 pp. Turin, Loescher. 1 lira 20.
- Hartman (J. J.) Epistola critica ad amicos J. van Leeuwen et M. B. Mendes da Costa, continens annotationes ad Odysseam. 8vo. 136, vi pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 3 M. 50.
- Horatius*. Sabat (N.) De synecdoche eiusque in Horati carminibus usu, vi atque ratione. 8vo. 36 pp. Lemberg.
- Karo* (G.) De arte vascularia antiquissima quaestiones. 8vo. 44 pp., 2 plates. Bonn.
- Livius*. Soltan (W.) Die Quellen des Livius im 21. und 22. Buch. II. Teil: Livius' 22. Buch und Plutarch. 4to. 20 pp. Zabern.
- Lucanus*. Ackermann (R.) Lucans Pharsalia in den Dichtungen Shelley's. Mit einer Uebersicht ihres Einflusses auf die englische Litteratur. 8vo. 35 pp. Zweibrücken.
- Peyronel (B.) Uso del congiuntivo in Lucano. Parte I. (Congiuntivo indipendente.) 8vo. 57 pp. Catania. 2 lire.
- Lucianus*. Spath (O.) Analecta critica ad Lucianum. 4to. 29 pp. Bruchsal.
- Lucretius* (T. Carus.) De rerum natura libri sex. Revisione del testo, commento e studi introduttivi di Carlo Giussani. Vol. I. (Studi Ineziani.) 8vo. LXXXII. 285 pp. Turin, Loescher.
- Lysias*. Accusatio obretractationis adversus familiares. Ed. et instr. Nat. Vianello. 12mo. 14 pp. Turin.
- Meyer* (G.) Wann hat Kleon den thrakischen Feldzug begonnen? 8vo. 15 pp. Ilfeld.
- Müller* (H. F.) Euripides Medea und das goldene Vliess von Grillparzer. II. 4to, 31 pp. Blankenburg.
- Nemesianus*. Cisorio (L.) Della imitazione nelle eghloghe di M. A. Olimpio Nemesiano. 8vo. 30 pp. Pisa.
- Novák* (Rob.) Observationes in scriptores historiae Augustae. 8vo. 42 pp. Prag. 1 Mk.
- (Aus 'České Museum filologické, II.)
- Ovidius*. Schoener (C.) Ueber ein Gesetz der Wortstellung im Pentameter des Ovid und über die Bedeutung der Cäsur für den Satzton. 8vo. 31 pp. Erlangen.
- Plato*. Arnim (J. v.) De Platonis dialogis quaestiones chronologicae. 4to. 21 pp. Rostock.
- Plautus*. Silbernagl (A.) De Stichis Plantinae compositione. 8vo. 10 pp. Teplitz.
- Plinius*. Abert (F.) Die Quellen des Plinius im XVI. Buche der naturalis historia. 8vo. 75 pp. Burghausen.
- Procopius*. Brückner (M.) Zur Beurteilung des Geschichtschreibers Prokopius von Caesarea. 8vo. 63 pp. Ansbach.
- Propertius*. Schiavello (Gius.) Studio su Sesto Propertio. 8vo. 116 pp. Naples.
- Schwartz* (E.) Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman. 8vo. vi, 148 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 3 Mk.
- Spandl* (J.) Der Ablativus absolutus und sein Verhältnis zum gewöhnlichen Ablativ. 8vo. 11 pp. Gava.
- Terenti Adelphoe. Principia critica ab usitatis diversa rec. M. Giltbauer. Cum specimine editionis quadricoloris. 8vo. xiv, 32 pp. Vienna. 1 Mk. 20.
- Terentius*. Möller (C.) Quaestiones metricae de synalophae qua Terentius in versibus jambicis et trochaicis usus est ratione. 8vo. 55 pp. Münster.
- Tibullus*. Ehrengreuber (S.) De carmine Panegyrico Messalae Pseudo-Tibulliano. VII. 8vo. 73 pp. Kremsmünster.
- Hirschfeld (O.) Zu Tibullus I. 7, 11. 8vo. 2 pp. Berlin.
- Rossi (Jo.) De carminibus quae tertio Tibulli libro continentur. 8vo. 20 pp. Patavii.
- Urkunden (Aegyptische) aus den kgl. Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Vol. II., parts 7 and 8. Royal 4to. Pp. 193-256. Berlin, Weidmann. Each part 2 Mk. 40.
- Vergilius*. Fabricius (V.) De Jove et fato in P. Vergili Maronis Aeneide. 8vo. 24 pp. Leipzig.
- Korn (H.) Supplemente zur Aeneis aus dem 15. und 17. Jahrhundert. 8vo. 43 pp. Nürnberg.
- Rollone (L.) Il Timavo in Virgilio. 8vo. 15 pp. Milano.
- Vergil's Aeneide (in Auswahl) herausgegeben von M. Fickelscherer. Hilfsheft und Kommentar. 8vo. iv, 39; vi, 222 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Wahl* (T. de.) Quomodo monstra marina artifices graeci finxerint. Capita selecta. 8vo. 53 pp. Bonn.
- Weber* (Lotar.) Die Lösung des Trierenrätsels. 8vo. iii, 80 pp., engravings. Danzig. 1 Mk. 50.
- Woltjer* (J.) Serta romana. Poetarum decem latinorum carmina selecta, ed. et notis instruxit. 8vo. vi, 278 pp. Groningen, Wolters. 3 Mk. 20.
- Xenophon*. L'Anabase, livre IV. expliqué littéralement et annoté par F. de Parnajon et traduit par Talbot. 16mo. 147 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 Fr.